

Concordia

Theological Monthly

Vol. XII

OCTOBER, 1941

No. 10

Privileges and Obligations

(Paper read at the convention of the Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States at Fort Wayne, Ind., June, 1941)

I

In the name of the Prince of Peace, our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, today, and forever, we are assembled here for the purpose of considering ways and means to bring the Gospel of peace to a war-torn world and to build, maintain, and extend His Kingdom of Grace and peace in a world enslaved by sin and Satan, harassed by war and rumors of war, by malice and hatred and deadly enmity. Almost one hundred years ago a considerably smaller number of men came together in Fort Wayne, Ind., and in other communities of the Central States of our Union with the very same aim in mind. Their object was to join together as Christian brethren for the conservation and promotion of the unity of the true faith, for a united defense against schism and sectarianism, and for the extension of the kingdom of God wherever and whenever opportunities would be offered by the Lord of the Church. From the fall of 1845 to the fall of 1846 these men met a number of times in spite of great inconveniences and huge expense, the trip from St. Louis to Fort Wayne costing no less than \$50 and requiring a four days' none-too-pleasant journey. After prayerful consideration the constitution for the proposed synod, drafted by Dr. Walther and discussed in a number of conferences, was finally approved and signed by sixteen pastors who had met for that purpose in September, 1846, at the parsonage of Pastor Wilhelm Sihler here at Fort Wayne. Synod was organized and met for its first convention in April, 1847, at Chicago, Ill., and one of its first actions was to adopt officially the constitution so painstakingly and conscientiously elaborated by these faithful men

imbued with love of their Savior and their fellow-men and gifted with a keenness and scope of vision such as only heroic faith can create. This constitution has served our Synod for almost a century, and we pray the Lord of the Church that the day may never come that Synod will change the principles laid down in this time-honored document or, while leaving the letter of the constitution unaltered, will ignore its principles and violate its spirit.

While the constitution was being discussed by pastors and congregations, and after the final draft had been published in the *Lutheraner* of September, 1846, there were voiced particularly three misgivings. First, the fear that Synod might interfere with the rights of the congregation. In fact, on the insistence of Trinity Congregation, Dr. Walther's own congregation, Article VII was added, defining the relation of Synod to its members. The second was the apprehension that the governmental policy proposed by the Constitution was altogether too democratic, depriving the clergy of its rights and powers. Some opponents went so far as to charge Walther with having opened the gates to an unbearable *Poebelherrschaft*, mob rule. A third misgiving was voiced by such as did not see the need, and doubted the right, of congregations to unite into such a man-made union as a synod.

In spite of these criticisms and misgivings our Synod has grown and flourished for almost 100 years. The reason is evident: Our Constitution gives to pastors and congregations all the rights and privileges granted to them by the Lord of the Church and expects and urges all its members, both congregations and pastors, to carry out faithfully and to the best of their ability all the obligations incumbent upon them by virtue of these privileges. And as long as neither laity nor clergy abuse the glorious rights procured by the Savior and given by Him to His bride, the Church; as long as neither pastors nor congregations neglect and shirk the obligations and duties so intimately linked up with these privileges and powers, so long will our Synod, by the grace of God, grow and flourish, be blessed by the Lord and be a blessing to untold generations.

Yet we must not close our eyes to the fact that the ancient triumvirate, the devil, the world, and our own flesh, is still as active as ever and still as resourceful as ever and still as antagonistic, as bitterly and unrelentingly opposed, to Christ and His Church as ever. We cannot deny that dangers *do* threaten the welfare and successful progress of our Synod and may prove detrimental to its very life and existence as a truly Lutheran body. To the superficial observer these dangers may seem to be inherent in, and inseparably connected with, the principles laid down in our Constitution. Yet that is not, and cannot be, the

case, for these principles rest solidly on Scripture. If and when these dangerous symptoms are present, they find their ultimate cause either in the abuse of the privileges and rights which our Constitution on the basis of Scripture grants to the members of Synod or in the neglect of those duties and obligations which our Constitution, again on the basis of Scripture, asks and expects of Synod's pastors and congregations.

In Article III of its Constitution, Synod defines its objects, and professes as one of its purposes "the protection of pastors, teachers, and congregations in the performance of their duties and *the maintenance* of their rights." (Art. III, 8, p. 3.) In order to protect to the full the rights of the congregations affiliated with Synod, Article VII was put into our Constitution, defining the Relation of Synod to Its Members. "In its relation to its members Synod is not an ecclesiastical government exercising legislative or coercive powers, and with respect to the individual congregation's right of self-government it is but an advisory body. Accordingly, no resolution of Synod imposing anything upon the individual congregation is of binding force if it is not in accordance with the Word of God or if it appears to be inexpedient as far as the condition of a congregation is concerned." (P. 5.)

Here a question arises: "If Synod is not to exercise legislative or coercive power; if it cannot pass any laws nor force any congregation to obey Synod's rules; and if Synod promises not to interfere with the individual congregation's right of self-government, why does it demand in Article VI as a condition of membership the acceptance of the Scriptures as the Word of God and the Symbolical Books, the renunciation of unionism of every description, the exclusive use of doctrinally pure agenda, hymn-books, and catechism in church and school? Do not these conditions interfere with the rights of the congregation and practically nullify its self-government? The answer is, No! No individual Christian and no Christian congregation has the right to choose its own confession or doctrine. The doctrine to be taught by every Christian congregation and by any synod of Christian congregations is definitely and decisively determined by Him who is the one and only Master of the Church, Christ Jesus, and is laid down for all times in His Holy Scripture. No congregation has the right to teach what its Master has forbidden to teach. A Lutheran synod has not the right to permit its congregations to teach what Jesus has forbidden. In insisting that all its congregations must confess the Bible as God's Word and the Lutheran symbols as the true doctrine, Synod is not interfering with the rights of a congregation, it is merely doing what the Lord demands of all who desire to be and remain His disciples indeed. It is merely con-

tinuing in His Word and demanding of its congregations what the Lord demands of them, to continue in His Word.

The same apostle, however, tells us that God is not a God of confusion but of peace. He commands the Christians, "Let all things be done decently and in order," 1 Cor. 14:33, 40. This word applies to all Christians, to all congregations; it applies to our Synod also. The congregations constituting Synod have been commissioned by the Lord to carry on mission-work. That is a huge task, requiring careful planning, close financing, conscientious selection of men and officials who are entrusted to carry out these plans. That is Synod's business, the business of the whole Church, the business of every individual congregation, the business of every individual Christian. As many as are members of that royal priesthood, that chosen nation, have been called and commanded by the Lord to show forth the praises of Him who hath called them out of darkness into His marvelous light, 1 Pet. 2:9. Yet we cannot possibly call together all the individuals or all the congregations which have combined to do this work. We have adopted the order to plan Synod's work by choosing delegates who, in convention assembled, agree on a well-defined program and on certain ways and means, on a mode of procedure which promises a successful carrying out of the program. Naturally, these delegates cannot meet every week, every month, or every quarter year. Our delegates meet only every third year. The amount of business to be transacted at such a meeting is an enormous one, as even a brief glance at the *Book of Reports and Memorials* will prove. To accomplish anything, there must be certain rules and regulations, there must be order. If every one having a suggestion to make or some plan to propose would have the liberty to speak as long as he pleased on the floor of the convention, there would not be the remotest possibility to finish the huge amount of business before the convention. God does not want His work to remain undone, to be delayed. He wants it to be accomplished, completed, brought to the finish. And He wants it to be done in an orderly way and not in confusion, because He Himself is not a God of confusion but of peace.

God might have laid down certain rules and regulations to be strictly observed within His Christian congregation, as He did in the Old Testament for His chosen people. God, however, deals with His New Testament Christians not as with minors who, while they possess all the rich blessings of God, yet are under tutors and governors, appointed by the Lord Himself, from whom they must take their orders just like the servants in the home. God rather deals with us as being of age, as with free men, and trusts us to find proper ways and means to carry on His work

in the most efficient manner possible. What a marvelous trust does our heavenly Father place in His children on earth!

In keeping with the will and trust of God, Synod has chosen the order of transacting the business coming up at the triennial convention by assigning the various items to be proposed to Synod to larger or smaller committees for careful consideration and specific recommendations to the convention. The delegates then are in a position to vote intelligently, to weigh the arguments pro and con, to accept or reject the propositions of the committees as the majority sees fit.

Synod meets in convention ten days every third year. Synod's business goes on during the remaining 1,085 days of the triennium. Again we have adopted the plan of transacting this business by committees, by boards, by our officials, etc., who are to carry out the resolutions of Synod. I firmly believe that this plan, if not the only way, is at least the best way in which Synod's business, our Church's business, can be carried on successfully, and we shall have to retain this way until a better one has been found. God demands that we be orderly in conducting the Church's business, and He certainly wants us to make use of the best possible ways and means. So we are safe in stating that God is well satisfied and pleased with the manner we have adopted in conducting our affairs and that He will bless our work carried out in an orderly manner in keeping with His will.

On the other hand, we must not overlook the fact that because of our sinfulness there is a danger lurking in every man-made plan and device. And as I see it, there is a twofold danger threatening. The one, that the delegates, the pastors and the laymen sent here to conduct Synod's business, do not take the proper interest in Synod's affairs. Only too frequently we meet with people who make it their motto, "Let George do it." "Why did we choose a committee? The men on the committee are good men, able and conscientious. They have studied the matter thoroughly and in the fear of God. Their recommendations surely may be and ought to be accepted." Such an attitude is the first step toward that very danger against which Article VII of our Constitution lifts up a warning finger. The delegates are not sent here merely to be yes-men, merely to rush the matter through as rapidly as possible, merely to adjourn at the earliest opportunity. The delegates are supposed to come here well prepared. Old Trinity Congregation at St. Louis met no fewer than nine times between May 20 and June 18, 1846, to study and consider the new constitution. When it had been approved by the sixteen pastors at Fort Wayne, Trinity again carefully studied the whole question. No one objecting, Trinity finally resolved

to join Synod, provided that Article VII be added, safeguarding the rights of the congregation.

Let every member of Synod take like interest in the affairs of his Church. Before the convention the Book of Memorials was sent to every pastor of Synod and another copy to every lay delegate. This book is to be carefully studied by the pastors, the delegates, and their congregation. If they have any suggestions to make, any criticisms to offer, any changes to suggest, let their chosen delegates attend the meetings of the committee to which this particular problem has been assigned, or let them submit their recommendations in writing. And when finally the committee reports and recommends a certain action, then let us not simply vote for it because we feel that the committee ought to know best. Let us carefully weigh the arguments advanced, and if necessary, and if the matter is of sufficient importance, let us once more on the floor of convention voice our own opinion and then vote intelligently, conscientiously, in the fear of God, and with the knowledge that we are responsible to the Church and to our God for our vote.

Let us thank God that He has given to His Christian congregations the right of self-government and that our Constitution guarantees this liberty to all its congregations. And let us make use of these rights and not shun the obligations connected with these privileges. There is no quicker way to lose these rights than carelessness and negligence in their use. Only unthankful persons will refuse to make the proper use of God-given blessings, and ingratitude calls down upon itself the punishment of God, the curtailment, perhaps the complete loss, of our precious liberty of Christian self-government.

There is another danger to be guarded against, that of losing our rights and privileges by permitting any individual or any group to usurp the authorities granted to all Christians, to set up any form of autocratic government.

Christ tells His Christians: "Be not ye called Rabbi [master]; for one is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren, Matt. 23:8. In the Church of Christ there is but one Master, one Ruler, Christ. His Word and will must rule supreme and absolutely. There is to be no higher and lower clergy in Christ's Church. In the kingdom of Christ there are not to be rulers and subjects, dictators and vassals, despots and slaves. No individual and no body of men has the right to usurp authority over any child of God or any group of Christians. That would not only be doing violence to his equals, his fellow-kings and fellow-priests, that would be a flagrant violation of the decree of the only Lord and Ruler of the Church: "Be not ye called Master; for one is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren."

In conducting the work of the convention there is to be no endeavor to create a synodical machine, no back-stairs plotting and counter-plotting, no electioneering, no lobbying for private interests and pet schemes of an individual, no church politics, no intrigues, no parliamentary trickery, no railroading of any resolution, no steam-rolling the convention; Synod is assembled as a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation. We meet here as brothers, as equals, every one a priest by divine appointment, every one a king by God's ordinance. The humblest Christian and the highest official, the smallest congregation in the backwoods and the largest, richest church in the metropolis, all have been endowed by the Lord with equal rights. Let each one be granted the right to voice his opinion in an orderly manner, and let every one submit to the rules and regulations adopted by the convention. Let no one insist on special privileges which cannot be granted to all without interfering with, and delaying, other matters of importance. Let all questions under consideration be discussed openly and frankly, in committee or on floor of the convention, as the case may require. Let the whole problem be put fairly and squarely before the assembly, without minimizing or exaggerating either the difficulties or the benefits and blessings. Let the matter be presented objectively, without prejudice, truthfully, so that every member present may understand the situation and vote intelligently.

As it would be sinful for any one to usurp authority within the Christian Church, it is equally sinful for any Christian congregation or individual to relinquish those rights which the Son of God has so graciously granted to the congregation as well as the individual. I say, no individual and no congregation and no synod has the right to sign away, or turn over to any other individual or body, the right of self-government, the liberty from bondage to any man-made yoke. The price paid for these rights by Him who procured them and presented them to His Church as a precious bridal gift, that price is too great to allow the Church to cast this gift aside as of little or no value. The Son of God has laid down His life in order to gain liberty for His Church, and He expects His Church to esteem this liberty, watch jealously over it, and cling to it with all her strength.

Particularly in times of storm and stress, of general unrest and uncertainty, the only feasible way to conduct Synod's business may seem to be to turn it over entirely to a committee or board to act according to their own discretion. And the very volume of business to be transacted may seem to make it imperative to entrust it in ever-increasing measure to boards and commissions, to individual groups working under a more or less cen-

tralized seat of power. But on that very account we must exercise particular and prayerful care in the selection of those men to whom we entrust the guidance and direction of our Synod and its work. How are these men to be chosen? By election or by appointment? If by election, ought the election be by ballot or by acclamation, by synod-wide vote or by the vote of the delegates? If they are to be appointed, should that be done by an individual or by a committee? If by an individual, who shall he be? If by a committee, how shall this committee be constituted and how chosen? Some more questions. How shall the candidates be proposed? By nomination from the floor of Synod or by a committee? If from the floor of the convention, shall the right of nomination be confined to the voting delegates, or shall it be extended to the advisory delegates or to all congregations? Shall the nominations made by a committee be final or subject to ratification? I sincerely believe that this matter ought to be given careful consideration, so as to avoid, on the one hand, disorderliness, a cluttering up, and disorganization, which would seriously hamper or make impossible the successful execution of Synod's business, and to avoid, on the other hand, an overcentralization of power with all the dangers that may involve.

A question of even greater importance is to obtain the proper men, the best qualified for the position, such men as meet the requirements laid down in Holy Scripture, men of honest report, full of faith and of the Holy Ghost and of wisdom, men who have the gift of government, of initiative, of true progressiveness, and who are at the same time unflinchingly loyal to the eternal principles laid down in God's Word; men who have the welfare of the Church at heart, men who, forgetting selfish interests and local advantages, will work with self-sacrificing zeal for our beloved Synod. Have we such men? Why, the Lord Jesus Himself, whose promises in Him are yea, and in Him Amen, 2 Cor. 1:20, has promised such men as His gift to the Church He loves. We read: "When He [Christ] ascended up on high, He led captivity captive and gave gifts unto men. . . . And He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ," Eph. 4:8, 11, 12. The men we need are already in our midst, presented to our Church as a gift by the heavenly Bridegroom. Let us look for them; let us choose these men whom the Lord wants to serve us; and when these men are chosen, let them serve. Let neither false modesty nor the preference for a life of quiet and peaceful service keep them from heeding the call extended to them by the Lord Jesus through His Church.

As long as Synod in the fear of God continues to seek to choose in an orderly manner from the laity and from the clergy as their leaders such men as put the will and Word of their Lord and the welfare of their Church above all other considerations, and as long as these men work faithfully according to their abilities in the work assigned to them, and are supported by the prayers and the sincere and whole-hearted cooperation of all members of Synod, there will be no danger of losing our precious rights and privileges as a royal priesthood nor abusing them to the detriment of Christ's holy Church. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. Gratitude for the privileges granted us, a vivid realization of the duties incumbent upon us by virtue of these rights, a ready willingness to carry out our Christian obligations, will by the grace of God insure to us the continued blessing of our heavenly Father.

II

The Lutheran Church is called the Church of the open Bible. Is our Church deserving of this name? Christ, the Lord of the Church, has given to the Christians a marvelous bridal gift, His holy Word, the Scriptures. There the Church hears the voice of her heavenly Bridegroom and rejoices greatly. Christ has instituted the holy ministry, the office of His Word. He has promised to His Church preachers and pastors to feed His flock on the green pastures and to lead it beside the still waters of His precious Gospel. Are we as grateful for these gifts as Christ has a right to expect us to be? Do the members of our Church, do the pastors, do the teachers, do the laymen, of our Church, know the Bible as well as they ought to know it? The Lord of the Church tells us: "If ye continue in My Word, then are ye My disciples indeed, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free," John 8:31,32. If we continue in His Word. Beyond His Word there is no spiritual freedom, because beyond His Word there is no saving truth. God's truth and Christ's freedom are to be found only in Christ's Word. And to continue in this Word is possible only if we know the Word, the Word of Christ as it is recorded in Holy Scripture. Therefore Christ earnestly urges us: "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of Me," John 5:39. The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life," John 6:63, and Christ speaks to us in Scripture. The Christians at Berea are called noble men because they received the apostolic message with all readiness, not as the word of men but, as it is in truth, the Word of God, and they searched the Scriptures daily whether those things were so. Acts 17:11; 1 Thess. 2:13. Are the lay members of our Synod

as eager to study the Word of God? Are they truly noble men like the Bereans of old?

Our pastors, who are, like all Christians, to continue in the Word of Christ, who are to preach this Word, the whole counsel of God as revealed in His Book, our pastors have need of daily thorough study of God's Word. No matter how urgent their other duties may be, no matter how much time must be devoted to reading other books, a pastor cannot afford to become negligent in Bible-study. Timothy, the able assistant of Paul, knew the Holy Scriptures from a child; yet he is not told that he no longer needed the Bible after he had come of age and had been pastor for some time. Paul tells this pastor that Scripture is able to make him wise unto salvation through faith in Christ Jesus. And the reason? "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness," 2 Tim. 3:16. And already in his first letter Paul had written his beloved Timothy: "Till I come, give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine. . . . Meditate upon these things, give thyself wholly to them, that thy profiting may appear to all. Take heed unto thyself and unto the doctrine, continue in them; for in doing this, thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee," 1 Tim. 4:13-16.

If we pastors want to save ourselves and them that hear us, here is the way, the only way,—diligent, prayerful, continued study of our Bible. And if our Synod is to flourish, if it is to be the blessing that God wants it to be, if we are to be a shining light in the midst of a crooked and perverse world, here is the way, the only way,—that pastors and laymen study the Word, search the Scriptures, for that and that alone is a lamp unto our feet and a light unto our path.

Next in importance to faithful devotion to every word of Scripture is the proper esteem for the office of the holy ministry, which Christ has established for the preaching of His Word. Our Church cannot flourish unless both congregations and pastors realize the sacred character of the office of the ministry. Both the clergy and the laity must remain fully conscious of the fact that Christ is the Lord of His Church, of the pastors and the people, and that Christ retains for Himself the right to choose the sphere of activities for His messengers. It is not for the pastor to choose his own field of labor, nor is it for the congregation to prescribe to the Lord just which preacher it wants. The pastors must keep in mind at all times that they are servants, bond-servants, slaves of the Lord, and that the Lord decides where His servants shall work in His vineyard. When Christ calls, when it becomes evident that Christ wants a pastor to serve in a par-

ticular field, then let him respond at once, "Here am I; send me"; let the pastor be grateful that the Lord honors him by permitting him to feed the lambs and the sheep bought by the Savior's blood. It would be ungrateful, sinful, a shameful presumption, if a pastor by letter or postal or telegram or personal appeal or through friends or relatives cried out, "Here I am; call me, call me." As bondservants of the Lord we have no will, no choice, of our own. As faithful ambassadors we work where the Lord has placed us.

On the other hand, the congregations must at all times remember that, though they are priests and kings, though all things are theirs, whether Paul or Apollos or Cephas or the world or life or death or things present or things to come, though all are theirs, yet they are Christ's, subject to Him, to His Word and will, to His rule and order.

We are fully aware that not every pastor fits every congregation. The needs and requirements of a congregation may not be supplied by every pastor, and the gifts of a pastor may not be required in every congregation. We do know, however, that the Lord of the Church has a pastor ready for every congregation. He who knows the needs of every individual congregation, He who is anxiously concerned for the temporal and eternal spiritual welfare of every individual congregation, He has a man in mind and in readiness for every congregation. How will the congregation find its man? By taking heed to this matter also according to the Word of Christ. Christ has given very clear and definite instructions to His Church, which a congregation will gladly follow in calling a pastor. It will not be out of place to take a brief glance at these rules.

Writing to the congregation at Corinth, Paul very distinctly states that Christian pastors are the ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God and that the essential requirement in every steward is faithfulness, loyalty, unflinching loyalty, to his Master. And this Master demands loyalty in life and in doctrine. A pastor must be an example to his parishioners in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity, 1 Tim. 4:12. And in his second letter Paul solemnly charges Timothy before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at His appearing and His kingdom: "Preach the Word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long-suffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine, but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers having itching ears. And they shall turn away their ears from the truth and shall be turned unto fables. But watch thou in all things, endure afflictions, do

the work of an evangelist, make full proof of thy ministry," 2 Tim. 4: 1-5.

Such are the men whom Christ wants to serve in His Church and whom He wants His congregations to call. Christian congregations will heed these instructions of their heavenly Bridegroom. They will remember that Christ does not promise to send perfect pastors, that He uses human beings, sinful men, to be His ambassadors to sinful men. Even if Christ would send perfect, sinless men, they could not possibly please all men and at the same time be loyal to their Lord. Paul certainly was as ideal and faithful a servant of the Lord as any, and still there were men in the congregation at Corinth who were dissatisfied with him and openly voiced their grievances. His bodily presence was weak and his speech not as rhetorical as these fastidious critics demanded. And while Paul was a sinful, imperfect man, there was a man, holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, Jesus, the God-man, and He failed to please all His hearers. In the synagog at Nazareth all that heard Him began to wonder at the gracious words which came out of His mouth, until He touched a sore spot, until He threatened them with rejection if they refused to believe. Then all they in the synagog, when they heard these things, were filled with wrath and rose up and thrust Him out of the city and led Him unto the brow of the hill whereon their city was built, that they might cast Him down headlong, Luke 4: 28, 29. A Christian congregation will not expect a perfect pastor but will be satisfied with the men with whom Christ is satisfied and, like their Bridegroom, learn to overlook the failings and short-comings of their pastor so long as he is a faithful steward of his and their Lord.

On another occasion Paul reprimands the congregation at Corinth for a fault found very frequently in our congregations, the overestimation of certain externals, certain qualities, which, while desirable, still are not at all essential characteristics of a faithful pastor. The Corinthians made unwarranted distinctions between the different apostles and preachers serving the Christian Church. There was an overstressing of the personality of the preacher, of his individual characteristics, his talents, his temperament. They forgot that, after all, it was not the personal gifts of the pastor that was of prime importance, but his message and his faithfulness in putting whatever gifts God had given him into the service of the Lord and His Church. Seeking to correct this fault, Paul administers quite a sharp rebuke to the Corinthians. We read in his first letter, 1 Cor. 3: 4-7: "While one saith, I am of Paul, and another, I am of Apollos; are ye not carnal? Who, then, is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man? I have planted, Apollos

watered, but God gave the increase. So, then, neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase." And when, instead of complying with Paul's exhortation, they continued in their foolish overestimation of unessential matters, he felt compelled to reprimand them still more severely. "For ye suffer fools gladly, seeing ye yourselves are wise. For ye suffer if a man bring you into bondage, if a man devour you, if a man take of you, if a man exalt himself, if a man smite you on the face," 2 Cor. 11:19, 20. "But I fear lest by any means, as the Serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ. For if he that cometh, preacheth another Jesus, whom we have not preached, or if ye receive another spirit, which ye have not received, or another gospel, which ye have not accepted, ye might well bear with him," 2 Cor. 11:3, 4.

There is an important lesson for all congregations in these words of apostolic reproof. A congregation despising its faithful pastor, continually finding fault with his actions, be they ever so correct and manifesting ever so clearly his loyalty to his Lord; a congregation unwilling to put up with minor shortcomings; a congregation unceasingly criticising, backbiting, gossiping, such a congregation serves not its Lord, who has said: "Touch not Mine anointed and do My prophets no harm," Ps. 105: 15. Such a congregation does not serve the welfare of its pastor, its God-appointed steward. The constant opposition, open or secret, will gradually make it impossible for the pastor to do his work with joy. The ministry will become to him an unbearable burden, until finally he resigns, a man broken in spirit and frequently a physical and mental wreck. Nor will such congregations serve their own interest. They actually uproot what has been carefully sown and planted; they tear down what has been painstakingly built up; they destroy what by the pastor's faithful work has been accomplished; they hinder their own growth both numerically and spiritually. Rather ought all congregations that have a faithful pastor to thank God for His gracious gift. Their pastor may not be a silver-tongued orator; he may not be as polished in his manners, not as brilliantly gifted, not as learned, not as young, not as good-looking, as others: as long as Christ has given them a faithful shepherd, who conscientiously does his duty, they ought to thank God and esteem their pastor very highly and be at peace with him and love him as an ambassador of Christ, sent to them by Him who has told His messengers: "He that heareth you heareth Me; and he that despiseth you despiseth Me; and he that despiseth Me despiseth Him that sent Me."

Many a pastor who possesses only average gifts, who is not at

all what we usually call an outstanding man, who does not excel his fellow-pastors in any particular, has, by the grace of God, become a very successful pastor, largely because he had the full cooperation of his vestry, of his members, men and women, young and old; because his congregation did not expect him to pull the cart alone, while they applied the brakes and took an uncanny delight in putting obstacles in his way. And when finally, exhausted by his efforts, he collapsed, they were only too glad to get rid of him; they asked him to get out of the harness, or they simply unharnessed him and told him to look for another job. If, on the other hand, the congregation members recognize in their pastor a gift of God, the man their Lord and Savior has sought out for them, they will be grateful and will love their pastor for his work's sake. They will work together with him, and he will grow in experience and in knowledge and in wisdom and in spirit and in love to his people. Shepherd and flock are content and happy, peace and harmony rules. The congregation flourishes, is richly blessed, and becomes a blessing unto many.

Permit me, finally, to call your attention to the order which the congregations of our Synod have adopted to safeguard the sacred character and the divinity of the call and to protect the rights of congregations and pastors in this respect also. In the By-Laws of Synod's Constitution the "Rights and Duties of the District Presidents" are defined, and one of the duties prescribed to these officials by the congregations is that they "advise the congregations of their District as to the calling of pastors and teachers." By-Laws, p. 28, D, 1. And on page 48, 2b we read: "Since the calling of servants of the Word is a most important matter, for which the advice of experienced men, who are also well acquainted with synodical conditions, is needed, and since the duty of the Presidents of the various Districts is to advise congregations upon their request, congregations, pastors, teachers, and students must not unofficially interfere in the matter of calls and elections. (4. S. Hdbk., [1899], pp. 10, 11, 147.)"

According to these stipulations the congregations of Synod have made it the duty of the President of their District to advise them in the calling of pastors and teachers. Thereby they have agreed to consult with the President of their District and ask his advice whenever they call a pastor or teacher. That is a very wise and useful order. Our officials are men who have at heart the welfare of Synod at large and of their District and of every congregation within their District. They are men who know the needs of the congregation and the qualifications of the pastors within their District better than most other pastors. The District Presidents can most readily obtain information from other District

Presidents as to suitable candidates for a congregation. We have chosen them for their responsible position because we have the confidence in them that they are men particularly qualified to perform the duties that we require of our Presidents. We have agreed to consult them in calling a pastor. Do we do that? Do pastors and congregations ask their District President to advise them in this important matter? And do we ask them not only as a matter of form but with the intention of carefully considering their advice and prayerfully weighing their reasons why they recommend their candidates? Or do we ask them only for the purpose and with the intention not to call the candidates they suggest? Brethren, we have agreed to request and to seriously consider the advice of our officials. If we do not regard them as capable of giving good advice, we should not have chosen them, or we should vote them out as quickly as possible. If they are worthy of our trust,—and I know of not a single one who is not trustworthy,—if they are worthy of our confidence, let us heed their advice. Many a congregation would have been much better served had they listened to the advice of their officials rather than followed the suggestion of a meddlesome, interfering busybody, whose chief interest was not the welfare of that congregation but his own personal advantage or the boosting of a friend or relative.

The congregations have very advisedly restricted the right to *offer* advice in the calling of a pastor or a teacher to the District President and to the pastor taking care of that congregation during the vacancy. While this regulation in no wise interferes with the right of the congregation to ask other men also for advice in so important a matter, it does intend to prevent, at least to curb, the inordinate, disorderly desire of pastors and laymen to obtrude their often ill-considered advice on the congregation or its members. Let us not forget that Christ still rules His Church and that Christ has told us: "Let all things be done decently and in order." If Christ wants *me* to advise a congregation, He will find ways and means that the congregation, mind you, the congregation, not only one or two members, but the congregation, through its officers, or the synodical officials ask me for advice. I have no right to appoint myself as an adviser to any congregation. Let all pastors and laymen guard against unofficially meddling with matters which do not concern them, and particularly against the shameful custom of wire-pulling, of unduly influencing the congregation to call one's favorite candidate. That is interfering with the rights and privileges of the Christian congregation; that is meddling with matters which Christ has in His hands. After all, it is Christ and His Holy Spirit that have the right to place their servants into the congregations. Who are

we in ill-advised and disorderly manner to interfere with the sovereign authority of our Lord?

Brethren, as members of the Lutheran Church we are proud to call ourselves the Church of the open Bible. Let us prove worthy of that name. Let not the Bible remain to us a book sealed with seven seals; the best seller, the book found in every home, yet a book unknown to us. Let us permit the Bible to become an open book to us by reading it, by studying it, by meditating upon it, by becoming ever better acquainted with it as the years go by, until it becomes to us a dear friend, a tried and trusty companion, whom we know well, whom we dearly love, whose words of advice and of warning and of admonition and of consolation we readily recall even when he does not happen to be at our side. And as we learn to love the Bible, let us by the grace of God learn to love and honor and esteem those men whom God has given to us that they should speak unto us the Word of God as they that must give account.

May God preserve to Synod a pious ministry and a pious membership, both laity and clergy loving and cherishing and highly esteeming the sacred Word and the sacred ministry of the Word.

III

Every Christian congregation is a sovereign body. Here is a community of saints, all cleansed, all justified, all sanctified, in the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of God. Here is an assembly in which all are brethren and sisters, all in equal measure children of God, all, without distinction, kings and priests before God. No pastor, no ecclesiastical official, no synod, nor any other body has the right to dictate the policies of the Christian congregation. Every Christian congregation is sovereign.

The Christian congregation, however, is not autocratic. An autocrat is a sovereign ruler whose power is unrestricted and who is responsible to no one. "Ye are all brethren," says Christ to His congregation, but only after having told them, "One is your Master." Christ ever is and always remains the Master, the King, the Lord Supreme. A congregation has no more right than Christ has given to it. A Christian congregation at all times is responsible to its King and owes absolute obedience to Him and His Word.

While Christ has assigned certain duties and obligations to His Church and has laid down a number of rules and regulations governing the administration of His Church on earth, He has entrusted the regulation and control of many matters of vital importance to the liberty, the wisdom, and the intelligence of His Christians. In the management of the business of the church, in the arrangement of their services, they may exercise to the

full their glorious rights and privileges which their royal priesthood has bestowed upon them. Yet even these matters Christ did not give out of His hands entirely. He Himself is a God not of confusion but of peace and harmony, 1 Cor. 14:33, and He demands that, even when He has turned the management of certain business over to His Christians, all things should be done decently and in order, 1 Cor. 14:40. The individual Christians have not the right to insist on their own opinion, to do as they please, and to refuse to cooperate with their brethren in any plan not to their liking. The individual Christian has not the right to refuse to go to church unless it begins at 9:30 o'clock, or to insist that he as a king and priest before God has the right to sleep till ten and not to come to church unless the service begins at eleven. That would not only be foolish, childish; that would be sinful. God is a God of order, and He has told His apostle to write it down as a divine command for all times to come that in the Christian congregation, in its worship and in the conduct of its business, all things are to be done decently and in order. Decently, that is to say in a manner that is generally regarded as proper, correct, becoming, fitting the high dignity of the Church; and in order, that is according to a methodical and harmonious arrangement arrived at by careful planning and carried out smoothly, without confusion and disturbance.

The apostle himself applied this divinely established principle in regulating the congregational affairs in the early churches. He tells the Christians at Corinth: "If any man speak in an unknown tongue, let it be by two or, at the most, by three, and that by course; and let one interpret. But if there be no interpreter, let him keep silence in the church; and let him speak to himself, and to God." 1 Cor. 14:27, 28. The congregation member did not have the right to speak publicly, even though he had the gift of speaking with tongues. Why not? "It does not edify," says the apostle, for no one could understand him. And it would not be "decent," proper. "If, therefore, the whole church be come together into one place, and all speak with tongues, and there come in those that are unlearned or unbelievers, will they not say that ye are mad?" 1 Cor. 14:23. A stranger coming into such an assembly babbling in various unknown tongues, would feel that he had accidentally run into a madhouse. — Again, when one began to prophesy in the public worship, he was not permitted to speak as long as he pleased. He had to yield the floor to the next one moved by the Spirit to prophesy. And the Christian had no right to complain, "That interferes with the free use of my gift granted to me by the Holy Spirit." What if it does, answers the apostle. God is not a God of confusion, but of peace. "But where

did God command that I must yield the floor while the Spirit still moves me?" God has said: "Let all things be done decently and in order. And since it is neither proper, seemly, nor orderly to have two men prophesying at the same time, we Christians have made this rule. That is the order established by us; and God wants all things to be done in order; God wants no confusion in the churches; you have no right to cause confusion, disorder. You have the right and duty to submit to the order established.

Paul knew that not all Corinthians would be satisfied with his presentation. He knew that many would be inclined to charge him with depriving them of their God-given rights, with dictatorship, with arbitrarily and autocratically prescribing rules to priests and kings who have no superiors. He very effectively silences all opposition. "What?" he exclaims. "Came the Word of God out from *you*? All the privileges you enjoy as Christians, all the spiritual gifts you possess, are not man-made, are not the result of your own wisdom and power. On the contrary, God's Word came to *you*. It is God who through His Gospel made you what you are and gave you what gifts and privileges you possess. It is God who has the right to tell you how and when to use these rights and gifts. And this God tells you: "Let all things be done decently and in order." God's priests and kings have not the right to be unruly and disorderly. God wants them to submit to those rules which they themselves have established for the preservation of decency and order in their midst.

Such proper, orderly conduct is God's will not only with respect to congregational, local customs and affairs. This rule applies also to the relation of congregations to their sister congregations. Paul very distinctly and definitely brings home this truth to the Corinthians and to all congregations. His second question is: "Or came it, the Word of God, unto you only?" You are, he means to say, under obligations not only to God, you owe consideration also to your sister congregations.

The whole Christian Church constitutes the body of Christ, the individual Christians and congregations being members of this body. To each Christian and to every congregation God has given certain gifts, and these gifts are to be used not only for the welfare and edification of the individual member or congregation. As in the human body all the members put their own peculiar gifts into the service of the whole body, so every Christian and every congregation must, according to the will of God, cooperate with all those of like faith in the great work of bringing the Gospel in its truth and purity to all mankind. In this business, commanded to the Church by its Lord Supreme, all congregations are to unite and work together in harmony and peace. That is a matter not

of their own choice; that is their God-appointed obligation. And in order that such peace and harmony in carrying on the work of the Lord be possible, the Ruler of His Church, who is a God of peace and not the author of confusion, has established the rule, which every Christian congregation must adopt: "Let all things be done decently and in order."

When some members at Corinth questioned the necessity of women's covering their heads while praying or prophesying, as the apostle had directed, Paul did not say that this was a divine mandate. There was no such command of God. Yet the apostle does not permit every individual Christian or congregation to do as they please. He reminds them of their obligations to consider other Christian congregations. He carefully explains the reasons why this custom was generally observed in the Christian congregations and why the Corinthians ought to observe this custom also. Paul knows that some will object, that since there is no divine command, the whole matter can be decided by the individual congregations. He does not deny the absence of a divine law and the liberty of the Christian congregations to adjust such matters. But he does deny the right of a Christian individual or congregation to be contentious, lovers of strife, fond of disputations, and he does deny the right of a Christian congregation to leave out of consideration its relation to its sister congregations and to the customs generally adopted and observed throughout the Church. He praises those who are willing to keep the ordinances as he has delivered them to the Corinthians, whether of divine institution or congregational customs; 1 Cor. 11:2. And he tells those who would change these customs for no other reason than that they had the liberty to do so: "If any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God." Neither the apostles nor the churches are lovers of strife, just as God is not a God of confusion, but of peace. From this viewpoint we will readily see that the founders of our Synod were following Scriptural example when they named in Article III of the Constitution as the fifth object of Synod the endeavor to bring about the largest possible uniformity in church practice, church customs, and, in general, in congregational affairs. That is in full keeping with the will of the Lord of the Church, "Let all things be done decently and in order." While Synod has not the right to command such uniformity, the congregations of Synod have the right and the duty to endeavor to establish uniform practices in their midst in order that in this respect also things may be done decently and in order.

When Paul and Barnabas had agreed with the apostles that henceforth they were to preach chiefly in the Gentile world, they

had also promised to remember their poor brethren in the Jewish-Christian congregations. Paul did this faithfully by impressing upon the converted Gentiles their duty to do good to all men, particularly to them that were of the household of faith, to support them financially in time of need. This work apparently assumed greater proportions as the enmity of the Jews toward the Christians in Palestine grew and poverty among the Jewish Christian congregations increased. In order to systematize this work, Paul proposed a plan to all the congregations which promised success without unduly burdening the Gentile Christians, most of whom could not boast of great wealth. Whether Paul himself or some one else had conceived this plan, we cannot tell, but we know that it was generally adopted by the congregations established by Paul. The plan, as outlined in 1 Cor. 16 and 2 Cor. 8:9, was to lay aside upon the first day of the week, Sunday, a certain sum, as the Lord had prospered every one. This collection was to be brought to Jerusalem by a delegation, the members of which were chosen by the congregations and properly accredited by letter, 1 Cor. 16:3; 2 Cor. 8:19, "avoiding this," says the apostle, "that no man should blame us in this abundance which is administered by us; providing for honest things, not only in the sight of the Lord but also in the sight of men," 2 Cor. 8:20, 21. Again we see the underlying principle, namely, that all things be done decently and in order. For that very reason Paul is so careful to avoid every semblance of undue authority, of dictatorship. Although the congregations had adopted the plan, yet Paul very clearly states: "I speak not by commandment." "Herein I give my advice," 2 Cor. 8:8, 10. It was a humanly devised plan, a man-made system; prayerfully conceived, well considered, enthusiastically adopted, promising success exceeding all expectations, 2 Cor. 8: 1-5. Yet, after all, it was not a plan prescribed or commanded by God, and Paul would have been the last to claim divine authority for a human system.

And still Paul looked for full cooperation in this plan on the part of the congregation. They had made this plan their own by willingly adopting it and were no longer free to do as they pleased. Paul had used this willing adoption of the plan by the Corinthian congregations as an incentive to other congregations. He writes, "For I know the forwardness of your mind, for which I boast of you to them of Macedonia that Achaia was ready a year ago; and your zeal hath provoked very many," 2 Cor. 9:2. And when the congregation at Corinth failed to keep its promise, Paul did not let the matter drop. In his first letter he reminds them of the collection they promised to gather and urges them to begin at

once, in order "that there be no gatherings when I come," 1 Cor. 15:2. He tells them frankly that he would not accompany the delegation to Jerusalem unless it was really worth while. When this brief reminder did not rouse the Corinthians, he devotes two chapters of his second letter to this matter. He does not mince words. While he knows and concedes that he has no right to command, he at once adds that he speaks because others were so willing and in order to prove the sincerity of their love and promise. "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ that though He was rich, yet for our sakes He became poor, that ye through His poverty might be rich," 2 Cor. 8:9. — Though he must say that he can only advise, yet he adds: "For this is expedient for you, who have begun before not only to do but also to be forward a year ago. Now, therefore perform the doing of it, that, as there was a readiness to will, so there may be a performance also out of that which ye have," 2 Cor. 8:10, 11. And he wrote not only the two letters; he sent Titus and another brother to admonish them personally. "Yet have I sent the brethren, lest our boasting of you should be in vain in this behalf, that, as I said, ye may be ready, lest haply, if they of Macedonia come with me and find you unprepared, we (that we say not, ye) should be ashamed in this same confident boasting. Therefore I thought it necessary to exhort the brethren that they would go before unto you and make up beforehand your bounty, whereof ye had notice before, that the same might be ready, as a matter of bounty and not as of covetousness," 2 Cor. 9: 3-5. That is doing church-work decently and in order, according to a carefully devised plan and using every proper means to carry this plan to success. Paul did not infringe upon the sovereignty of the congregation. No. In the first place, the support of the poor was a duty commanded by the Lord, one which they could not shirk. In the second place, that same Lord had commanded that in the business of caring for the poor as in all business of the congregation all things be done decently and in order. And, in the third place, the systematic manner in which this work was to be carried out had been agreed on and adopted by the vote of the congregations; they had pledged their support; they had obligated themselves, and God expected them to carry out this work in the order agreed on. They were not driven like slaves. They were not suffering an unbearable dictatorship. They were not dominated by an autocratic hierarchy. No; as highly privileged priests and kings before God, they were gratefully carrying out the marvelous work the Lord had assigned to them. They were publishing by word and deed the praises of Him who had called them out of darkness to His

marvelous light and were doing this decently and in order, in keeping with His will.

Let us apply this to ourselves. Synod, I repeat it, has not the right to dictate to its congregations or to insist on the observance of any rule or resolution not laid down in the Word of God. Let us fight to the last any attempt to deprive our congregations of the liberty which Christ has procured for them, of the sovereignty which our Savior has given as a precious gift to His chosen bride, the Church. On the other hand, no congregation has the right to set aside the clear and unequivocal will of God "Let all things be done decently and in order." A synod constituted like ours is, thank God, not a body exercising arbitrary or autocratic powers. It is an assembly of congregations represented by their delegates, who meet to carry out the work which has been committed to them by their great God and Savior Christ Jesus; a body which meets to devise, and agree on, ways and means to carry on this work in the most practical and effective manner possible under existing circumstances. While our congregations are not bound absolutely to adopt the order proposed, yet they have of their own free will chosen the human device of synodical conventions to conduct their divinely commanded business in that orderly manner in which God wants all things to be done in the Church. And before arbitrarily refusing to lend Synod its full and complete and willing cooperation, let a congregation give careful thought to two considerations. The first, whether the refusal to cooperate with its sister congregations in the plan proposed by Synod is not in reality due to an unwillingness to do the Lord's work; in other words, whether they are not refusing Synod's plea and plan because they are actually refusing obedience to the command of Christ "Ye shall be witnesses unto Me unto the uttermost part of the earth." Perhaps their flesh is not willing to sacrifice, not willing to go to a little inconvenience for the sake of Christ's kingdom, and as an excuse they plead their liberty, the sovereignty of the congregation over against all human rules and man-made plans. Perhaps they forget that the work of missions is not a human device nor a man-made obligation but the will of Christ, a divinely imposed duty. The selfsame apostle who tells his Christians that they are a royal priesthood tells them in the same breath that they were made priests and kings for the purpose, "that ye should show forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of darkness into His marvelous light."

In the second place, let every congregation consider well whether such a refusal on their part is due to good and valid reasons, or whether, in denying their cooperation, they are not arbitrarily setting aside the will of God that in the Church all

things should be done decently and in order; whether the real reason of their refusal is not that contentiousness of which the apostle declares in no uncertain terms that it is not a custom in the churches of God. And it would be contentious if we should insist on our right to do as we please, on our privilege to be different, rather than to be willing to do all in our power to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

Sitting in his prison at Rome, yet constantly concerned about the churches he and his assistants had established, Paul, in writing to the congregation at Colossae, voices his joy on hearing of the steadfastness of their faith in Christ. But even before he speaks of their faith, he makes mention of his joy in beholding their *order*, their harmony, their willing cooperation. Col. 2:5. A far greater one than Paul is watching His congregations, our ascended Lord, sitting at the right hand of God the Father Almighty. Oh, that the sight that He beholds may fill His heart also with joy and rejoicing! May He behold our Synod and all its congregations standing steadfast in the faith of Christ, all the congregations keenly aware of, and unfeignedly thankful for, their glorious privileges and ready to defend them to the utmost; all equally aware of their solemn obligations and eagerly willing to fulfil them to the last letter; individuals all, and proud of it; each one having a special gift, special aptitudes, and every one determined to retain his individuality. Yet not one looking down disdainfully on any other, not one seeking to dominate, but all united in faith, in love, in hope; all—every congregation, every layman, every pastor—willing to put themselves and all their gifts into the service of the Lord and His Church; all presenting a united front, forming a body well organized, purposeful, determined to do the work of the Lord and do it well; each one having a task assigned him according to a carefully considered plan; each one working in harmony with all his colaborers; each one putting his shoulder to the wheel, shirking no effort; each one knowing that he may rely on all his brethren throughout the length and breadth of our Church to do their full share, so that no one will be left alone to finish what the Lord expects all to do.

"Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord," 1 Cor. 15:58. "Let all things be done decently and in order," 1 Cor. 14:40. And "unto Him that loved us and washed us from our sins in His own blood and hath made us kings and priests unto God and His Father: to Him be glory and dominion forever and ever. Amen," Rev. 1:5b, 6.

TH. LAETSCH

The Opinions of Modern Scholars on the Origin of the Various Apocryphal Books

(Concluded)

SONG OF THE THREE CHILDREN (AND PRAYER OF AZARIAH)

Concerning the non-canonical additions to the books of Esther and Daniel in the Bible which appear in the Apocrypha, Luther remarks in his "Vorrede auf die Stuecke Esther and Daniel": "Hier folgen etliche Stuecke, so wir im Propheten Daniel und im Buch Esther nicht haben wollen verdeutschen. Denn wir haben solche Kornblumen (weil sie im hebraeischen Daniel und Esther nicht stehen) ausgerauft, und doch, dass sie nicht verduerben, hier in sonderliche Wuerzgaertlein oder Beete gesetzt, weil dennoch viel Gutes und sonderlich der Lobgesang Benedicite drinnen gefunden wird."

"Before dealing with these additions individually, a word may be said about them collectively. None of them occur in the Hebrew Bible, and in only one manuscript of the Septuagint proper are they found (*viz.* Cod. Chisianus [87], a cursive of the ninth century); but in the great uncials (B, A, Q), which contain Theodotion's version of the Septuagint, they all appear as integral parts of the text of Daniel." (Swete, *Intr. to the O. T. in Greek*, p. 260.) What the actual number of additions originally was is uncertain; they are usually reckoned as three; it is possible, however, that five originally separate pieces were incorporated into the text of the Septuagint, *viz.*, the Story of Susanna, the Prayer of Azariah, a short narrative piece, the Song of the Three Children, and Bel and the Dragon. The second, third, and fourth of these are usually regarded as forming one piece; this question we shall consider immediately. Although some of the additions are quite inappropriate in their present context, they have from very early times been regarded as belonging to the Book of Daniel proper; "from the Fathers it is clear that in the earliest Christian copies of the Septuagint both Susanna and Bel formed a part of Daniel, to which they are ascribed by Irenaeus and Tertullian and, implicitly, by Hippolytus. The remarkable letter of Julius Africanus to Origen, which throws doubt upon the genuineness of Susanna, calling attention to indications of its Greek origin, forms a solitary exception to the general view; even Origen labors to maintain their canonicity." (Swete, *op. cit.*, p. 260) Clement of Alexandria also apparently regarded Susanna (*Stromateis*, IV) and the Song of the Three Children (*Eclogae Propheticae*, Par. I) and Bel (*Strom.*, I) as canonical; and a string of other authorities could be cited. (Oesterley, *op. cit.*, pp. 385, 386. Cf. Charles, *op. cit.*, p. 625 ff.)

"Von den fuerf Stuecken sind nur die beiden ersten, das Gebet Asarias and der Lobgesang der drei Juenglinge im gluehenden Ofen, mit dem Texte des Danielbuches in eine organische Verbindung gebracht. Sie sind zwischen Dan. 3:23 und 5:24 gestellt und in einigermassen geeigneter Weise durch Uebergaenge mit der Umgebung verbunden. Die andern Stuecke, Susanna und die beiden inhaltlich enger zusammengehoerigen Erzaehlungen Bel und der Drache, haben mit dem Danielbuche nur insofern zu tun, als in ihnen Daniel eine Rolle spielt." (Kautzsch, I, p. 172.)

In Rahlfs's edition of the Septuagint, which gives both the received text of the LXX and also that of Theodotion, we find the three parts which are usually considered as one, namely, the Prayer of Azariah, a short narrative piece, and the Song of the Three Children, added to Daniel 3:23 in both the LXX and Theodotion's version.

Oesterley (*op. cit.*, pp. 386—388) contends that the narrative piece which appears in the LXX text between Dan. 3:23 and Dan. 3:24 represents something which has "evidently fallen out of the text." When one reads the text as it appears in our English Bibles, there does seem to be a break which is certainly much smoothed out by the narrative piece which is added. Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, p. 173) hence says: "Unverkennbar klaeft im kanonischen Danielbuch zwischen 3:19-23 und dem mit V. 24 beginnenden Abschnitte der Erzaehlung im sachlichen Fortschritt oder doch in bezug auf die Motivierung einzelner Zuege des Folgenden eine Luecke. Diese Luecke scheint nun, wenigstens oberflaechlich betrachtet, durch die beiden Stuecke ganz passend ausgefuellt zu werden. Aber es scheint nur so. . . . Es bedarf kaum eines Nachweises, dass der Inhalt des Gebets nicht das Mindeste gemein hat mit der Lage, in der sich die befinden, von denen es ausgegangen sein soll." All authors seem to agree that neither the prayer nor the song really fit the situation and hence cannot be a part of the canonical Daniel.

As to the author of this piece of non-canonical literature Charles (*op. cit.*, p. 629) holds that he was "clearly" a Jew. Oesterley (*op. cit.*, p. 390) says that these pieces "quite distinctly breathe the Jewish liturgical spirit."

As to the original language of the Prayer and the Song Kautzsch makes the rather sweeping statement: "Die Frage, ob das 'Gebet' urspruenglich hebraeisch abgefasst war, wird seit Eichhorn von den meisten protestantischen Gelehrten verneint, dagegen von den katholischen Gelehrten durchweg behauptet, aber auch von einigen protestantischen. Selbst Reuss (*Gesch. der heil. Schriften A. Test.*, S. 437) erklart, dass wenigstens 'der Schein' dafuer spreche, dass die Gebete (d. i., Gebet und Lobgesang) auf

einer hebraeischen Grundlage beruhten; freilich fuegt er (sicher berechtigt) hinzu, man duerfe nicht vergessen, dass der Jude in Gebeten 'nicht anders als hebraeisch' habe denken koennen. Unseres Erachtens ist wenigstens fuer den urspruenglichen Psalm wahrscheinlich, dass er wirklich Uebersetzung einer hebraeischen Vorlage ist; es ist auch die Moeglichkeit nicht ausgeschlossen, dass selbst noch die Erweiterungen vor der Uebertragung des Ganzen ins Griechische erfolgt sind." (*Op. cit.*, p. 174.)

Charles (*op. cit.*, p. 627), after studying the evidence, comes to the conclusion: "The present writer is convinced that there was a Hebrew original." Cf. Pauly-Wissowa, p. 1601. Oesterley (*op. cit.*, p. 389 f.) says: "Like the Prayer, this Song was written in Hebrew, though the arguments for a Greek original in both cases cannot be lightly dismissed."

The date of composition of the original Hebrew must be about the time of the Maccabean struggle. "That the Prayer was composed during the early part of the Maccabean struggle seems probable for the following reasons," says Oesterley (*op. cit.*, p. 388), and then he adds the following quotations from the Apocrypha: Ep. Jer. vv. 5, 9, 14, 15; 1 Macc. 1:11—15, 20-24, 41-64. As to the Song he says: "Its tone of exultation is in strong contrast to the despondent tone of the Prayer; this is, however, one indication of the date of the composition, though a negative one, *viz.*, it cannot have been written during the Maccabean struggle. It cannot, on the other hand, have been written before this struggle, as the advanced belief [?] in the future life taught in verse 64 precludes that. . . . We must, therefore date it after the Maccabean struggle, probably soon after, on account of its jubilant tone." *Op. cit.*, p. 390. Cf. Charles, *op. cit.*, p. 629. Naturally we refuse to accept the view that the belief in a future life expressed here is an "advanced" one.

After a rather thorough discussion of the matter Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, p. 176) comes to this conclusion as to the date of the composition of the Prayer and the Song: "Die letzten Schluesse verlangen die Annahme, dass sie (die beiden Stuecke) vor der Herstellung der griechischen Uebersetzung (LXX) in den biblischen Danieltext eingefuehrt wurden; ihre eigene Entstehungszeit, da sie unmoeglich erst zum Zwecke der Einschaltung in diesen Zusammenhang gedichtet sein koennen (in diesem Falle sollte man groesseren Zusammenklang mit der Situation erwarten), muss also aelter sein als die Uebersetzung ins Griechische, und zwar als die Uebersetzung des ganzen Danielbuches ins Griechische. Letztere Annahme ist im Zusammenhange mit unsern Ergebnissen auch darum noetig, weil genaue Untersuchung der stilistischen Seite des griechischen Danielbuchs (LXX) mit derjenigen der Zusaetze ge-

zeigt hat, dass das Griechisch der Zusaetze auf dieselbe Hand zurueckgehen muss wie das der Uebersetzung des kanonischen Danielbuchs (cf. Fritzsche, a. a. O., S. 114; Ball, a. a. O., S. 309, auch Bludau, S. 161). — Freilich ist es nun fraglich, wann die LXX-Uebersetzung des Danielbuchs gemacht worden ist. Wenn es richtig ist, dass 1 Makk. 1:54 die griechische Uebersetzung von Daniel 11:31; 12:11 voraussetzt (vgl. oben, S. 36, sowie Fritzsche, a. a. O., S. 112), so wuerde man mit der zeitlichen Ansetzung der LXX-Uebersetzung dieses Buches spaetestens in das erste Viertel des letzten Jahrhunderts vor Christi Geburt gehen muessen (vgl. Fritzsche a. a. O., S. 121). Die Entstehungszeit der beiden hier zu-naechst in Frage stehenden Stuecke in ihrer Urgestalt wuerde dann noch frueher fallen. Sicherer laesst sich nicht ausmachen."

As to the place where this Prayer and this Song were written, no definite statements can be made. All that can be said is that they probably were composed in the Holy Land. Cf. Kautzsch, Charles, and Oesterley.

Bibliography

- Bruell, "Das apokryphische Susanna-Buch," in *Jahrbuecher fuer juedische Geschichte und Literatur* (1877).
 Wace, II, pp. 305—360.
 Schuerer, II, pp. 182—188.
 Julius, *Die griechischen Daniel-Zusaetze und ihre kanonische Geltung* (1901).
 Daubney, *The Three Additions to Daniel* (1906).
 Kautzsch, I, pp. 172—193.
 Charles, I, pp. 625—664.
 Marshall, in *Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible*, sub v.
 Kamphausen, in the *Encycl. Bibl.*, sub v.
 Swete, *Introduction to the O. T. in Greek*, p. 260 (1900).

THE STORY OF SUSANNA

"The position of this addition varies in the manuscripts, in some it precedes the first chapter of the canonical Daniel; this is the case in the uncials, while in the one manuscript extant of the Septuagint proper which contains it, it forms chapter 13 of that book." (Oesterley, *op. cit.*, p. 391.)

In Rahlfs's edition of the LXX this story is found at the beginning of the canonical Book of Daniel, contains 63 verses, and is recorded in both the received LXX version and the Theodotion version.

As to the difference of these two renditions Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, pp. 176, 177) says: "Es ist schon oben auf die Tatsache hingewiesen worden, dass sehr auffaellige Verschiedenheiten zwischen der Gestalt dieser Erzaehlung, wie sie die LXX bieten, und der von Theodotion dargebotenen vorhanden sind. Allerdings muss schon eine oberflaechliche Betrachtung der beiden Erzaehlungsgestalten an-

erkennen, dass ihnen einer und derselbe stoffliche Kern zugrunde liegt. Aber ebensowenig kann es genauerem Eingehen verborgen bleiben, dass das in ihnen gebotene Gesamtbild durch die Verschiedenheiten in den Einzelzuegen eine so verschiedenartige Faerbung zeigt, dass nichts anderes uebrigzubleiben scheint als die Annahme, hier zwei besonderen Ausgestaltungen des gleichen Erzaehlungsstoffes gegenueberzustehen. Bei genauer Vergleichung nicht bloss des Inhalts der beiden Textgestalten, sondern auch des Ausdrucks im einzelnen kommt man jedenfalls nicht mit der Annahme aus, die z. B. Fritzsche a. a. O., S. 119, vgl. S. 114, zur Loesung des Problems vertreten zu koennen gemeint hat, Theodotion habe den Text der LXX bloss ueberarbeitet, die Erzaehlung erweitert, abgerundeter und wahrscheinlicher gemacht. Man erkennt bei den meisten Einzelabweichungen, um nicht zu sagen bei allen, durchaus nicht, was Theodotion bewogen haben sollte, die Erzaehlung im LXX-Text so umzugestalten, wie es geschehen ist; man erkennt dies um so weniger, als auch die Erzaehlungsgestalt der LXX in ihrem Aufbau ein wohlgeordnetes und ueberall wohl motiviertes Ganze darbietet. Man wird unsers Erachtens den einfachen Tatsachen nur gerecht, wenn man zugibt, dass es sich hier um zwei Parallelgebilde desselben Erzaehlungsstoffes handelt (vgl. Bludau a. a. O., S. 178 ff.). Allerdings sind mit diesem allgemeinen Satze nicht alle sich aufdraengenden Fragen erledigt; aber wir muessen uns hier damit begnuegen. Dass die Susannageschichte ein beliebter Lese- und Erzaehlungsstoff war und darum auch leicht in seiner Form und in seiner inhaltlichen Gestaltung Wandlungen und auch gelegentlich Mehrungen ausgesetzt gewesen ist, bedarf kaum einer besonderen Begrueundung, und dass auch, nachdem sie schriftlich fixiert war, des Zuwachsens, wenn auch nicht zu dem eigentlichen Gewebe der Erzaehlung, so doch zu den leichter Erweiterungen vertragenden oratorischen Partien, kein Ende gewesen ist, dafuer legt, wie oben schon erwaehnt wurde, die syrische Uebersetzung zur Genuege Zeugnis ab."

After giving the contents of the book, Oesterley (*op. cit.*, p. 394) says: "The author's aim, therefore, in writing this book, was to show by means of a story that the administration of justice was in some most important particulars defective and to put forth the Pharisaic suggested reform as the proper remedy."

According to Charles and Oesterley the story of Susanna was written by a Pharisee who appears to have been a supporter of Simon ben Shetach. Cf. Oesterley, *op. cit.*, p. 394; Charles, *op. cit.*, p. 644.

That the original language was in all probability the Hebrew is the contention of Oesterley, Charles, and also Hautsch. Cf. Oesterley, *op. cit.*, p. 394; Charles, *op. cit.*, p. 642; Pauly-Wissowa,

p. 1602. Says Oesterley: "The language was in all probability Hebrew."

Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, pp. 177, 178), however, is not so readily convinced that it was originally written in Hebrew. He says: "Die Frage, ob diese Erzählung in ihrer griechischen Form auf einer hebraeischen Vorlage beruht, wird von weitaus den meisten protestantischen Forschern mit noch grösserer Entschiedenheit verneint als bei dem Gebet und Lobgesang. Selbst Reuss, a. a. O., S. 637, findet hier nicht einmal den dafür sprechenden Schein, den er für jene wenigstens zugibt. Aber ausser den katholischen Gelehrten (vgl. zuletzt Bludau a. a. O., S. 185 f.) fehlt es auch nicht ganz an protestantischen Forschern, die jene Frage zu bejahen geneigt sind (so Eichhorn, Delitzsch, mehr oder wenig zweifelnd Bissel und Ball). Vor allem führt man (schon Julius Africanus verwies Origenes gegenüber darauf) die allerdings stark für ein griechisches Original sprechenden Wortspiele in V. 54, 55 und V. 58, 59 (LXX; Theod.) an, die in unserer Uebersetzung leider verlorengehen mussten (vgl. die Anm. zu den genannten Versen). Allerdings sagt schon Origenes, er habe keinen Juden finden können, der ihm zu sagen imstande gewesen wäre, welcher hebraeische Ausdruck diesen Wortspielen zugrunde liegen könnte. Immerhin schliesst das nicht aus, dass ein hebraeisches Original zugrunde liegt."

Oesterley (*op. cit.*, p. 394) claims that this book "was written by a Pharisee during the last quarter of the first century B. C." Charles (*op. cit.*, p. 644) holds that it was written 95–80 B. C. Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, p. 178) says: "So würde die erste schriftliche Aufzeichnung der Erzählung, falls wir ein hebraeisches Original voraussetzen dürfen, vielleicht noch im zweiten Jahrhundert v. Chr. angesetzt werden müssen. Natürlich lässt sich mit irgendwelcher Sicherheit über die Frage nichts ausmachen."

As to the place of composition Oesterley claims that it was written in "Jerusalem (or, at any rate, in Palestine)." (*Op. cit.*, p. 394.)

Bibliography

Bruell, "Das apokryphische Susanna-Buch," in *Jahrbücher für jüdische Geschichte und Literatur* (1877).

Wace, II, pp. 305–360.

Schuerer, II, pp. 183–188.

Scholz, *Judith und Bel und der Drache* (1896).

Julius, *Die griechischen Daniel-Zusätze und ihre kanonische Geltung* (1901).

Daubney, *The Three Additions to Daniel* (1906).

Kautzsch, I, pp. 172–193.

Charles, I, pp. 625–664.

Oesterley, 391–394.

Marshall, in *Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible*, sub v.

Kamphausen, in the *Encycl. Bibl.*

Swete, *Introduction to the O. T. in Greek*, p. 260 (1900).

BEL AND THE DRAGON

"This addition follows the preceding one in all the Greek manuscripts, by which it is treated as an integral part of the canonical Daniel," says Oesterley (*op. cit.*, p. 394). Charles (*op. cit.*, p. 652) has this to say: "In the Greek Codd. Bel and the Dragon stands at the end of the canonical Book of Daniel, bearing therefore no direct title. . . . In the Vulgate, Bel and the Dragon forms chap. 14 of Daniel. . . . Bel and the Dragon is the title in all Protestant versions of the Apocrypha."

In Rahlfs's edition of the LXX this piece is found at the end of the canonical Book of Daniel. It consists of 42 verses on five pages and is given according to the received LXX version and the Theodotion version. It, however, carried the separate title *Bel et Draco*, or: BHA KAI DPAKON.

At the beginning of this piece we have the words "From the prophecies of Habakkuk, the son of Jesus, of the tribe of Levi" (Greek: 'Εκ προφητείας Ἀμβακούμ υἱοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Λευι).

Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, p. 178) says: "An der Spitze dieser beiden miteinander verbundenen und ihrer inhaltlichen Tendenz nach gleichartigen Erzählungen steht in den beiden handschriftlichen Zeugen des LXX-Textes, sie seien aus der Prophetie des Habakkuk, des Sohnes Jesus' vom Stamme Levi, genommen. Dass damit kein anderer Prophet gemeint sein kann als der Zeitgenosse Jeremias', unter dessen Namen unter den sogenannten zwölf kleinen Propheten ein Buechlein geht, ist gewiss. Aber was es mit der 'Prophetie,' aus der unsere Erzählungen herkommen sollen, fuer eine Bewandtnis hat, kann niemand sagen."

"Nothing is known of the author of this book," says Charles (*op. cit.*, p. 656). While Oesterley contends (*op. cit.*, p. 396): "As it is not likely to have been written for Jews, the original language was probably Greek; there is nothing in the composition which indubitably stamps it as having been translated from a Semitic original," Charles is very sure that it was written in Hebrew. He has this positive language: "There is evidence conclusive to the present writer that the author of Bel and the Dragon wrote in Hebrew." (*Op. cit.*, p. 655. Cf. Pauly-Wissowa, p. 1602.)

Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, p. 179) says on the question of the original language: "In bezug auf die Frage nach einer hebraeischen Grundlage (vielleicht sogar je fuer die verschiedene Gestalt der Erzählung in LXX und Theodotion eine besondere) und nach der Entstehungszeit des LXX-Textes und der ihr vielleicht vorausgegangenen hebraeischen Textgestalt wird so wie bei "Susanna" geurteilt und auch wohl geurteilt werden muessen. Allerdings wird niemals eine unzweifelhafte Entscheidung gefaellt werden koennen, es sei denn, dass bisher noch unbekanntes Material ans Licht

trete. Es soll hier schliesslich nicht ungesagt bleiben, dass schon Origenes und andere Kirchenväter bezeugt haben, dass zu ihrer Zeit von einem hebraeischen Original dieser Geschichten nichts mehr bekannt war; freilich beweist das nicht, dass es nie ein solches gegeben hat."

According to Charles there is nothing definite known of the place of the composition of this book. (*Op. cit.*, p. 656.) Oesterley (*op. cit.*, p. 397) says: "It would be hazardous to attempt to assign any particular place as the home of this addition, beyond saying that, if we are correct in supposing that the little composition was written for propagandist purposes, it is more likely to have been written somewhere in the Dispersion than in Palestine."

As to the date the general character of the Greek suggests that the translation was made at Alexandria at a date not much later than 100 B. C. Cf. Charles, *op. cit.*, p. 656 f.

Bibliography

Oesterley, 394—397.

Charles, I, pp. 625—664.

Kautzsch, I, pp. 178, 179.

Rouse, *Greek Votive Offerings*, pp. 193 ff.

Scholz, *Judith und Bel und der Drache* (1896).

Julius, *Die griechischen Daniel-Zusätze und ihre kanonische Geltung* (1901).

Daubney, *The Three Additions to Daniel* (1906).

FIRST MACCABEES

What the actual title of the book in its original form was is not known. The Greek title *Μακκαβαίων α'* takes its origin from the surname applied, in the first instance to Judas (cp. 1 Macc. 2:4, 66; 2 Macc. 8:5, 16; 10:1, 16; etc.), but later on to all the members of the family and their followers. Cf. Charles, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

Oesterley (*op. cit.*, p. 411) says: "What the title of this book in its original Hebrew form was is not known for certain. Origen gives a transliteration of the title (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.*, VI, 25, 2) which is equivalent to 'The Book of the House of the Hasmonaeans'; but he transliterates here an Aramaic translation of the Hebrew; possibly this title represented the Hebrew form. On the other hand, the writer of the book has clearly taken as his pattern the Books of the Kings, so that the supposition is reasonable that he framed his title in accordance with the form of the title of these; in this case the title given in the Septuagint (which is followed in the English Apocrypha) would probably represent the original. The name 'Maccabees' was applied in the first instance to Judas (see 1 Macc. 2:4, etc.), but later to all the members of the family and their followers."

An interesting note as to the derivation of the name Maccabees is found in the introduction to the Books of the Maccabees in the Berlenburger Bibel to this effect: "Nun fragt sich, woher sie den Namen Makkabaeer dann bekommen. Da ist nun eine gemeine Meinung, dass der beruehmte Judas, der den Namen fuehrte, als er nach seines Vaters Tod und Verordnung die Stelle eines Generals und Anfuehrers im Feld uebernahm, um sein Vertrauen zu Gott oeffentlich an Tag zu legen, den hebraeischen Spruch aus dem Triumphlied Mosis, 2 Mos. 15:11: 'Wer ist dir gleich unter den Goettern, o Herr?' als einen Wahlspruch in seine Fahne hat setzen lassen. Weil aber die Worte nicht voellig ausgeschrieben, sondern durch Abkuerzung nur mit den Anfangsbuchstaben dieser Worte zusammengesetzt waren, wie *Senatus Populusque Romanus* auf den roemischen Fahnen durch die Anfangsbuchstaben S. P. Q. R. ausgedrueckt wurde; da ohnedem der Juden Gewohnheit allezeit gewesen, Sprueche und Namen vieler Woerter so abzukuerzen, und durch Zusammensetzung der Anfangsbuchstaben ein gekuenstelt Wort, darin alles gesteckt, zu machen, und also hier das Wort מַכְבִּי, Maccabi, herauskam, so wurden von der Zeit an alle, die unter dieser Fahne stritten, insonderheit aber und gleichsam im hoechsten Grad vor allen andern der, so Feldhauptmann unter ihnen war, Makkabaeer genannt." Note: Ex. 15:11 has these words in the Hebrew, from which מַכְבִּי was formed: מִי כָמֹכָה בְּיָהוָה.

As to the name of the book Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, pp. 24, 25) has this to say: "Der Name Μακκαβαίος ist nach 2:4 (vgl. auch 2:66) urspruenglich nur Beiname des Judas (im 2. Buch der Makkabaeer heisst Judas ausser an drei Stellen ueberall (8:5, usw.) kurzweg 'der Makkabaeer'), des dritten Sohnes des Mattathias, wurde aber spaeter auf das ganze Geschlecht und schliesslich (so z. B. in der Ueberschrift des sogenannten dritten Makkabaeerbuchs, das einen Vorgang der vormakkabaeischen Zeit erzahlt) auf alle Vorkaempfer der juedischen Religion gegen die Griechen ausgedehnt.

"Die wahrscheinlichste Deutung des Namens ist — unter der Voraussetzung von maqqabá als der urspruenglichen Namensform — noch immer die Herleitung vom aramaeischen maqqaba (hebr. מַקְבֵּית, Richt. 4:21 u. a.), der Hammer, wonach maqqabi etwa 'der Haemmerer.' Nun ist maqqaba allerdings nicht der Streit- oder doch Schmiedehammer, sondern der Arbeitshammer; trotzdem duerfte obige Deutung der von S. J. Curtiss (*The Name Machabee*, Lpz. 1876) vorzuziehen sein, der den Namen unter Berufung auf lateinisches Machabaeus = Μακκαβαίος (letzte Form bietet in der Tat Niese in Josephus, *Antiqu.* XII, 6, 1 usw.) von מַכְבִּי makhbi 'Ausloescher' (des Streits; vgl. Jes. 43:17) herleitet.

"Neben der Ueberschrift 'Erstes usw. Buch der Makkabaeer'

(in griech. Handschriften Μακκαβαίων α' β' usw.) findet sich bei juedischen Schriftstellern auch 'Buecher der Hasmonaeer' (aram. ספרי החשמונאים, von Chaschmon, griech. Ἀσαμωναῖος, den Josephus, *Antiqu.* XII, 6, 1, als den Urgrossvater des Mattathias nennt. Der urspruengliche Titel des ersten Buches aber lautet nach Origenes (bei Eusebius, *Kirchengesch.* VI, 25, 2) Σαββήθ Σαβαναίελ — ein noch immer ungeloeses Raetsel. Uebrigens bezeichnet Origenes an derselben Stelle das Buch auch als τὰ Μακκαβαϊκά."

The contents of the book are briefly described by Luther in his "Vorrede auf das erste Buch der Makkabaeer" as follows: "Dies Buch ist auch derer eins, die man nicht in die hebraeischen Biblien zaeht. Wiewohl es fast eine gleiche Weise haelt mit Reden und Worten wie andere der Heiligen Schrift Buecher und nicht unwuerdig gewest waere, hineinzurechnen, weil es ein sehr noetig und nuetzlich Buch ist, zu verstehen den Propheten Daniel im elften Kapitel. Denn dasjenige, so Daniel weissagt im genannten Kapitel von dem Greuel und Unglueck des Volks Israel, so zukuenftig sein sollte, desselben Erfuellung beschreibt dies Buch, naemlich Antiochum den Edlen, und wie Daniel spricht, die kleine Hilfe und grosse Verfolgung von den Heiden und falschen Juden, die zur Zeit der Makkabaeer geschehen ist. Derhalben es uns Christen auch nuetzlich ist zu lesen und zu wissen." (St. L. ed., XIV: 80, 81.)

After giving a short analysis of the contents of the book, Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, p. 24) says: "Hoechstwahrscheinlich war jedoch die Absicht des urspruenglichen Verfassers (s. u., S. 31 f.) nur auf eine Darstellung der Ereignisse vom Auftreten des Mattathias bis zu der gluecklichen Regierung Simons (mit Ausschluss des 14:16 ff. Erzaehlten) gerichtet.

"Mit dem Inhalt von 1 Makk. 1-8 deckt sich in der Hauptsache der Inhalt von 2 Makk. 4-15."

Oesterley (pp. 423-438), under the heading "The History of the Maccabean Struggle," gives the contents of this book at some length and passes criticism on the various parts as to their historicity.

Both Oesterley (*op. cit.*, 415 ff.) and Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, p. 25 ff.) give us a rather lengthy discussion of the sources of this book. Cf. Charles, I, pp. 61-65. It might be of interest to summarize what Oesterley has to say on the sources of 1 Maccabees. That the author or compiler of this book had sources is apparent from such passages as 9:22; 11:37; 14:18; 14:27, 48, 49; 16:23, 24; etc. In addition to these sources there are certain documents which have been incorporated into the book. In a general way these sources may be divided into three classes. There are, in the first place,

some letters of *Jewish* origin, as follows: (a) a letter from the Jews in Gilead asking Judas to send them help because they were attacked by the Gentiles (5:10-13); (b) a letter from Jonathan to the Spartans (12:6-18); (c) a letter from Areios, king of the Spartans, to Onias, the high priest (12:20-23); (d) a panegyric of Simon and his reign, engraved on tables of brass and set up in the sanctuary (14:27-47). A second class of documentary sources comprises letters from *Syrian kings* to the Jewish leaders: (a) a letter from Alexander Balas to Jonathan (10:18-20); (b) a letter from Demetrius I to the Jewish nation (10:25-45); (c) a letter from Demetrius II to Jonathan, enclosing one to Lasthenes (11:30-37); (d) a letter from Antiochus VI to Jonathan (11:57); (e) a letter from Demetrius II to Simon (13:36-40); (f) a letter from Antiochus VII to Simon (15:2-9). A third class of documentary sources includes sources which record the relations between the Jews and the *rulers of foreign kingdoms*. Such are: (a) a treaty of alliance between the Romans and the Jews (8:23-32); (b) a letter from the Spartans to Simon (14:20-22); (c) a letter from Lucius, the Roman consul, to Ptolemy Euergetes II, king of Egypt (15:16-21).

"These, then, are the sources from which our book was compiled; they show that the writer of 1 Maccabees had access to a number of official documents in addition to the accounts of events which he received from eye-witnesses. The documentary sources shed a most valuable light on the external policy of the Jews as well as on the important role they played in shaping Syrian politics, so that for the history of the Jews of this period our book may well be described as the most valuable source which we possess." (Oesterley, *op. cit.*, p. 423.)

Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, pp. 25 ff.), who also gives us a rather lengthy discussion of the sources, is not as sure of the historicity of the book, for he says: "Fragt man nun, wieweit die Geschichtsdarstellung unsers Buchs den Namen einer urkundlichen verdient, so werden allerdings an dem landlaeufigen, fast durchaus guenstigen Urteil einige Abzuege zu machen sein. Dass die Zahl der von wenigen Juden bekaempften und getoeteten Feinde oft eine verdaechtige Hoehe erreicht (vgl. besonders 7:46 und die 100,000 in Kap. 11:48), ist gegenueber dem apologetischen Eifer katholischer Theologen (die in den Makkabaeerbuechern einen Bestandteil des Kanons zu verteidigen haben) laengst anerkannt. Dabei hindert jedoch nichts die Annahme, dass der Verfasser in gutem Glauben berichtet, was ihm (der Natur der Sache nach vielfach nur auf Grund einer ungefaehren Schaetzung) mitgeteilt war."

Though the name of the author or compiler is not known, both Charles and Oesterley contend that he was an ardent patriot,

a rigid adherent of orthodox Judaism, a Sadducee, and a native of Palestine. Cf. Charles, *op. cit.*, p. 56; Oesterley, *op. cit.*, p. 412. Says Oesterley: "As to the author, or more strictly compiler, of the book, it is clear that he was an ardent patriot and a rigid adherent of orthodox Judaism; his intimate knowledge of the geography and topography of the Holy Land marks him out as a native of Palestine. His religious standpoint is of particular interest, for he writes at a time when the distinct development of the Sadducees and Pharisees as opposing parties had already taken place." To show that he was a Sadducee, Oesterley refers to the following statements in the book: chap. 2:41; 10:43 ff.; 2:52 ff.; 3:18 f.; 4:10 ff.; 9:46; 12:15. Cf. Kautzsch, I, p. 26.

As to the original language of the book Oesterley makes bold to say: "That this book was originally written in Hebrew scarcely admits of doubt; we have already pointed out that the writer framed his work on the pattern of the Books of the Kings, a fact which in itself suggests that he wrote in Hebrew. But apart from this there are numberless indications in our present Greek text which stamp it indubitably as a translation from Hebrew." (*Op. cit.*, p. 415.) Charles (*op. cit.*, p. 61) fully agrees with him.

Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, p. 25) says: "Dass unser Buch aus einem hebraeischen Original ins Griechische uebersetzt sei, wird, abgesehen von dem Titel, den Origenes ueberliefert hat, ausdruecklich bezeugt von Hieronymus im sogenannten *Prologus Galeatus* (*'Machabaeorum primum librum hebraicum reperi'*). Dabei ist jedoch noch immer fraglich, ob an eigentliches Hebraeisch oder an das palestinensische Aramaeisch zu denken sei, welches bekanntlich im Neuen Testament u. a. gelegentlich auch als 'Hebraeisch' bezeichnet wird. Die unlegbar zahlreichen Hebraismen [Note: 1:16; 2:48; 13:17] wuerden auch bei einem aramaeisch schreibenden Juden, der in der Sprache des Alten Testaments lebte, wohl begreiflich sein, wie umgekehrt gewisse sogenannte Syriasmen (vgl. Grimms Kommentar zu 1:5; 2:19) bei einem hebraeisch schreibenden, dem das Aramaeische als Umgangssprache gelauefig war. Immerhin sprechen allerlei Eigentuemlichkeiten der Diktion, die auch durch die Uebersetzung nicht verwischt sind, weit eher fuer ein hebraeisches als ein aramaeisches Original, und dieses Urteil findet eine starke Stuetze in einigen Uebersetzungsfehlern (vgl. die Anmerkungen zu 1:28; 4:19, 24; 14:28), die sich am einfachsten unter der Voraussetzung eines hebraeischen Originals erklaren lassen."

In *Das Buch der Maccabaeer in Mitteldeutscher Bearbeitung* the anonymous author says as to the original language of the First and the Second Book of the Maccabees:

Darnach volgen ware mere
genant zwei buch der stritere,
Machabeorum ich meine —
also heizen sie gemeine —
die sente Jeronimus ouch
us fremdir scrift in latin zouch.
Daz erste buch er *judisch* vant,
daz andir criechisch was irkant;
uz der beiden zungen schine
er sie brachte zu latine. (P. 1.)

Concerning the date of the book in the original language Charles (*op. cit.*, p. 60) says: "Roughly speaking, therefore, the book must have been finished sometime between the years 100—70 B. C., nearer the former than the latter date." Cf. Pauly-Wissowa, p. 1615.

Says Oesterley: "The First Book of Maccabees must have been written between the dates 135 B. C. and 63 B. C. The events recorded in the book took place between the years 175 B. C. and 135 B. C., so that this latter date is the earliest possible at which it can have been written." (*Op. cit.*, p. 413.)

Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, p. 31) has this to say on this subject: "Als die aeusserste Grenze fuer die Entstehung unsers Buches ist von jeher mit Recht das Jahr 63 v. Chr., d. h., die Eroberung Jerusalems durch Pompejus, betrachtet worden. Der Verfasser verraet keine Ahnung davon, dass die Roemer jemals aus Freunden und Beschuetzern zu Zwingherren der Juden werden koennten. Anderseits schien die 16:24 erwaehte Geschichte des Hohenpriestertums Joh. Hyrkanus' den Tod desselben (105 v. Chr.) vorauszusetzen, und es verblieb somit fuer die Abfassung des Buchs der Zeitraum von ca. 100—70 v. Chr. Liegt jedoch nach dem oben S. 29 Eroerterten der urspruengliche Schluss des Buchs in 14:16 vor, so koennte es (da 14:4 der Tod Simons vorausgesetzt ist) noch unter Joh. Hyrkanus, also zwischen 135—105 verfasst sein."

The authorities make no positive statements as to the date of the translation of the original nor as to the place where it was translated. If, as some assume, the author was a native of Palestine, he probably also wrote in that land. Cf. Kautzsch, Charles, Oesterley.

Bibliography

- Grimm, "Das erste Buch der Maccabaeer erklart," in *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des A. T.* (1853).
 Keil, *Commentar ueber die Buecher der Maccabaeer* (1875).
 Bissel, "The First Book of Maccabees," in *Lange-Schaff's Commentary* (1880).
 Schuerer, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 6—13.
 Fairweather and Black, "The Frist Book of Maccabees," in the *Cambridge Bible* (1897).
 Kautzsch, *op. cit.*, p. 24 ff.
 Knabenbauer, in *Cursus Scripturae Sacrae* (1907).
 Charles, I, p. 56 ff.
 Willrich, *Juden und Griechen vor der makkabaischen Erhebung*, p. 70 ff.
 Weiss, H., *Judas Makkabaeus* (1897).

SECOND MACCABEES

In Rahlfs's edition of the Septuagint this book bears the title: Μακκαβαίων β'. The editor adds the note: "Inscr. μακ(κ)αβαιων β' AV; cf. subsc." At the end of the book we read: Subsc. ιουδα του μακκ(αβ)αιων πραξεων επιστολη Α and ιουδα μακκαβαιων πραξεων επιτομη V."

As to the title of this book Charles makes the interesting statement: "2 Maccabees is the anonymous *ἐπιτομή* (2:26, 28), or digest, of an earlier Maccabean history which has been composed by a Hellenistic Jew called Jason of Cyrene. The writer condensed Jason's five books into one.—2 Maccabees is not a sequel to 1 Maccabees. It is, in Luther's words, a second book of the Maccabees' struggle, not *the* second book." (*Op. cit.*, p. 125.)

The words to which Charles here refers as found in Luther read: "Dies heisst und soll sein das andere Buch Maccabaeorum, wie der Titel anzeigt. Aber das kann nicht recht sein, weil es etliche Geschicht meldet, die vor des ersten Buches Geschichten geschehen sind, und nicht weiter kommt denn auf den Judam Maccabaeum, das ist, bis in das siebente Kapitel des ersten Buchs, dass es billiger das erste denn das andere sollte heissen, man sollte es denn heissen 'ein anderes Buch' und nicht das andere Buch Maccabaeorum, *aliud vel alienum, scilicet, non secundum*. Aber wir lassen's so mit hingehen, um der schoenen Geschichte willen der sieben Maertyrer Maccabaeorum und ihrer Mutter und anderer mehr Stuecke." (*St. L. ed.*, XIV:82.)

Kautzsch in his evaluation of the book (*op. cit.*, p. 81) quotes Luther to this effect: "Sein Gesamturteil aber lautet: 'So billig das erste Buch sollte in die Zahl der Heiligen Schrift genommen sein, so billig ist dies andere Buch herausgeworfen, obwohl etwas Gutes drinnen steht.'" Cf. *St. L. ed.*, XIV:85.

All that can be said with any degree of certainty of the author is that "he belonged to Alexandrian rather than to Palestinian Judaism," thinks Charles (*op. cit.*, p. 131). Luther has this note in his "Vorrede auf das zweite Buch der Maccabaeer": "Es siehet aber, als sei es nicht ein Meister gewesen, sondern zusammengeflocht aus vielen Buechern." (*St. L. ed.*, XIV:84.)

Chapter 2:19-32 explains the origin of the book. An account of the heroic doings of Judas Maccabaeus and his brothers had been drawn up by a certain Jason, the Cyrenian, in five books. These five books the compiler essays "to epitomize in one volume" (2:23). Verses 30, 31 of this chapter indicate that the writer uses Jason's history as his sole source. Prefixed to the book are two letters, which have nothing to do with Jason's books. These two letters claim to have been written by Jews in Palestine to their brethren in the Dispersion. The first letter (1:1-9) purports to

have been written by the Jews of Jerusalem to their brethren throughout Egypt, exhorting them to observe the feast of the Dedication. The second letter (1:10 to 2:18) has a similar purpose. The remainder of the book consists of a preface (2:19-32), and an epitome of Jason's five books (3:1 to 15:39). Cf. Kautzsch, *op. cit.*, p. 81 ff.; Oesterley, *op. cit.*, pp. 479-493.

Oesterley (*op. cit.*, p. 493) holds that the book was originally written in Greek, for he says: "There is nothing in the book which points to its being a translation; it is manifestly written in Greek (with the exception, of course, of the two prefixed letters), as already Jerome saw (in his Prologus Galeatus)." The style is extremely uneven; at times it is elaborately ornate (3:15-39; 5:20; 6:12-16, 23-28; etc.), and, again, it is so rude and broken up as to seem more like notes for an epitome than a finished composition (8:19-26). (Westcott, in *Smith's Dict. of the Bible*, II, page 175.)

As to the language of the book Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, p. 82) says: "Was nun die gewaehlte, nicht nur kunstvolle, sondern haeufig auch gekuenstelte Sprache des Epitomators betrifft, so erkannte schon Hieronymus, dass es von Hause aus die griechische ist, nicht eine Uebersetzung aus dem Semitischen, wie uns eine solche im ersten Makkabaeerbuche vorliegt. Auch fuer den Hellenisten Jason wuerden wir auf den Gebrauch der griechischen als der in Kyrene (vgl. Apost. 2:10; 11:20) eingebuergerten Sprache gefuehrt werden. So sagt der Epitomator statt Panzer [θώραξ] lieber *Bepanzerungen* [θωρακισμούς] (5:3), braucht gerne ganz ungewoehnliche, ja sonst nicht nachweisbare (z. B. 14:11, 18) Woerter, liebt kuenstlichen Periodenbau (vgl. 15:19) und allerlei rednerischen Prunk, sucht ueberhaupt durch wohltoenende, zierliche and gezielte Rede Eindruck auf den Leser zu machen."

While the period of the history which the book covers can be fixed fairly accurately as 175-161 B. C., the date of the writing of the book cannot be fixed so easily. Says Oesterley (*op. cit.*, p. 493): "There is scarcely anything in the book itself which gives us any indication as to when it was written, the advanced [?] doctrine of the future life (in a non-apocalyptic book) and the tendency to ascribe divine activity among men to intermediate agencies alone suggesting a comparatively late date. On the other hand it is practically certain that Philo was acquainted with the book, for in his work *Quod Omnis Probus Liber* (Mangey, II, 45 a) a description is given of the way in which in time past the godly have suffered at the hands of persecutors which forcibly recalls the words in 2 Maccabees concerning Antiochus Epiphanes. Nothing more specific as to date can, therefore, be given beyond

saying that it was probably written shortly before the beginning of the Christian era."

Charles, after a lengthy discussion concludes: "The source of the epitome can hardly have been written earlier than ca. 139 B. C., while the epitome itself must be later than 125 B. C. Jason's work may be dated, therefore, roughly after 130 B. C.; the epitome probably falls not later than the first half of the first century B. C." (*Op. cit.*, p. 129.)

As to the time of the composition of the book Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, p. 83) has this simple note: "Noch Cornill (*Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, p. 267) nahm an, dass Jason frueher als der Verfasser des ersten Makkabaeerbuches geschrieben habe; Rawlinson setzte den Jason etwa um 100 v. Chr. an, wenn nicht noch frueher, den Epitomator nur um zwanzig Jahre spaeter."

As to the place where this book was written Oesterley (*op. cit.*, p. 493) says: "In all probability the book was written in Alexandria."

As to the original language of the letters Kautzsch says: "Die hebraeische Grundsprache scheint mir nicht erwiesen zu sein." (*Op. cit.*, p. 85.) Oesterley (*op. cit.*, p. 492) however claims: "Both these letters were originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic."

Bibliography

- Grimm, *Exegetisches Handbuch*, zu 2. Makkabaeer (1853).
 Wace, II, pp. 539—648.
 Schlatter, *Jason von Kyrene* (1891).
 Willrich, *Juden und Griechen vor der makkabaeischen Erhebung*, p. 76 ff. (1895).
 Schuerer, II, pp. 211—216.
 Kamphausen, in Kautzsch, I, pp. 81—119.
 Buechler, *Die Tobiaden und die Oniaden im 2. Makkabaeerbuche*, pp. 282—398 (1899).
 Niese, *Kritik der beiden Makkabaeerbuecher* (1900).
 Charles, I, pp. 125—154.
 Westcott, in *Smith's Dictionary of the Bible*, sub v.
 Torrey, in the *Encycl. Bibl.*, sub v.

THIRD MACCABEES

The Third Book of Maccabees consists of seven chapters in Rahlfs's edition of the Septuagint. The Third Book of the Maccabees contains no reference to the Maccabees, and the events recorded in it, which may rest upon some historical basis, are placed at an earlier date (217—209 B. C.). Charles therefore says in regard to the title of the book: "Maccabees really is a misnomer. . . . Πτολεμαῖα would be more accurate. . . . It is probable that the present title is not original. It may easily have arisen from its collocation with the other books of the Maccabees in the MSS." (*Op. cit.*, p. 155.)

"Das sogenannte dritte Makkabaeerbuch berichtet ueber Vorgaenge unter Ptolemaeus IV. Philopator (221—204)." (Kautzsch, *op. cit.*, p. 119.) Oesterley does not discuss this book. Jerome did not translate this book into Latin, and Luther did not translate it into German. It is not only shorter than the other books of the Maccabees; it is also of much less value.

The authorities consulted make no definite statements as to the author of the book. Charles hints that he might have been an Alexandrian Jew, when he says: "The book is a product of Alexandrian literature, exemplifying in its extremest form the pseudo-classicalism of the Atticist." (*Op. cit.*, p. 161; cf. Pauly-Wissowa, p. 1617.)

There seems to be no doubt that the book was written in Greek. Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, p. 121) says: "Dass das Buch von Haus aus griechisch geschrieben war, ist allgemein anerkannt."

Charles holds that it was written at Alexandria about 100 B. C. Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 155; Pauly-Wissowa, p. 1617.

Kautzsch says as to the date of the composition of the book: "Ueberhaupt muss bei der Bestimmung der Abfassungszeit ein weiter Spielraum gelassen werden. Da der Verfasser bereits die griechischen Zusaetze zu Daniel kennt, so kann er nicht wohl vor dem Ausgange des 2. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. geschrieben haben. Andererseits waere als aeusserster Termin das Jahr 70 nach Chr. anzusehen. Denn von der Unantastbarkeit des Tempels konnte so nur geredet werden, wenn der Tempel noch stand. Das meiste spricht fuer die Entstehung des Buchs im Anfange der christlichen Zeitrechnung; die erste Erwaehnung (*Μακκαβαίων τρία*) findet sich in canon 85 der apostolischen canones. Josephus kennt das Buch nicht (vgl. Schuerer a. a. O., II, p. 745).

Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, p. 121) contends that part of the beginning is lost. "Der Eingang ist durch irgendeinen Unfall verlorengegangen. Dafuer beweist nicht bloss die Partikel *ὅτι* im ersten Satze, sondern auch die Rueckverweisung auf jetzt Fehlendes, 1:2 und 2:25."

As to the literary value of the book Kautzsch has this very sweeping statement to make: "Was den schriftstellerischen Charakter des Buches anlangt, so ueberbietet es an Schwulst und ueberkuenstlicher gespreizter Rhetorik, geschraubten Wendungen und unnaturlichen Wortstellungen wohl alle andern Erzeugnisse derselben Literaturgattung. Wohl weiss der Erzaehler den Leser geschickt in Spannung zu erhalten, schaedigt aber den Eindruck empfindlich durch so ungeheuerliche Uebertreibungen, wie sie z. B. 1:17 ff.; 4:3 ff.; 4:17 ff. zu lesen sind."

Bibliography

Charles I, p. 155 ff.

Pauly-Wissowa, 1617.

Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, IV, 611 f.

Schuerer, II, 745.

Abrahams, "The Third Book of the Maccabees," in *Jewish Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1896, p. 39 ff.

FOURTH MACCABEES

This book is a Jewish-Stoic philosophical treatise on the supremacy of pious reason. It possesses no value as history. The writer merely appropriates certain incidents from 2 Maccabees (6:18 to 7:42) by way of illustrating his fundamental propositions. Cf. *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. IX, p. 498; *Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. III, p. 194.

In Rahlfs's edition of the Septuagint it has 18 chapters, covering 27 pages. The note there reads: "*Mac. IV: S. A.; traditur etiam inter opera Flavii Iosephi.*" The subscription reads: μακκαβαίων S. A. (*A. uidetur quaedam addidisse, teste Fritzschio ιωσηπου συγγραφη.*")

"The Fourth Book of Maccabees is concluded in the form of a discourse, or treatise, taking for its subject the power of ὁ εὐσεβὴς λογισμός, the Inspired Reason, the contest of passions. It has been suggested by Freudenthal that the work may be a specimen of synagog preaching, and Ewald appears to agree with him in this; but other commentators reply that in the Diaspora the regular synagog practice was always to take a passage from the Bible as a text for the sermon." (Charles, *op. cit.*, II, p. 653.)

The oldest form of the title is simply Μακκαβαίων δ', under which it is found in three of the great uncial MSS., the Alexandrinus, the Sinaiticus, and the Venetus." (Charles, *op. cit.*, II, page 654.)

"The authorship of Fourth Maccabees must be considered doubtful. It was attributed to Flavius Josephus by Eusebius, the learned bishop of Caesarea, who lived more than two centuries later than Josephus, or between A.D. 270 and 340. Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.*, III, 10) says: "The man [Josephus] has also produced another work of a lofty character on the Supremacy of Reason, to which some have given the title of Maccabean, because it includes the struggle of the Hebrews who in the book known as Maccabean strove valiently for the sake of righteousness before God." (Charles, *op. cit.*, II, p. 656.) Jerome says the same thing.

"The general conclusion is that the author was not Flavius Josephus, and that there is evidence to show that he was a Jew living in Egypt, most probably in Alexandria, within a few years of the Christian era." (Charles, *op. cit.*, II, p. 657.)

As to the author, W. Fairweather, in the article "Septuagint" in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, says: "The name of the author is unknown. He was, however, clearly a Hellenistic Jew, probably resident in Alexandria or Asia Minor." Cf. *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Vol. XVII, p. 200; *Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol. VIII, p. 242; Pauly-Wissowa, p. 1618.

The book is written in a cultured, somewhat involved, Greek style, is the opinion of such scholars as W. Fairweather, Israel Abrahams, and Hautsch. Cf. *Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. III, p. 194; *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Vol. XVII, p. 200; Pauly-Wissowa, p. 1618; *Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol. VIII, p. 242.

"The date of the original text is uncertain, but the author could never have spoken as he does of the Temple service had he been writing after the fall of Jerusalem in A. D. 70. . . . The date, then, probably falls between B. C. 63 and A. D. 38, or, roughly speaking, within the two generations before or one generation after the Christian era." (Charles, *op. cit.*, II, p. 654.)

As to the date the authorities mentioned above agree that the book was written at the close of the last century B. C. or at the beginning of the first century A. D. Cf. *Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. III, p. 194; *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Vol. XVII, p. 200; *Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol. VIII, p. 242; Pauly-Wissowa, p. 1619.

Israel Abrahams in his article "Septuagint," in the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol. VIII, p. 242, holds that it was written in Alexandria.

PRAYER OF MANASSEH

"This prayer is a beautiful one, finely constructed, full without being drawn out, and breathing throughout deep personal religion. It is certainly one of the best pieces in the Apocrypha." (Oesterley, *op. cit.*, p. 404.)

This tract purports to be the prayer of Manasseh, king of Judah, mentioned in 2 Chron. 33:18. Cf. Charles, *op. cit.*, p. 614.

In Rahlfs's edition of the Septuagint this prayer is found as number 12 of the odes which follow the Psalms and which bear the title "*Nouem Odae Ecclesiae Graecae*." Rahlfs adds the note: "*Odae: A. R. T. 55 (partim deficientes, cf. Sept., ed. Rahlfs, X [1931], pp. 79, 80); B. S. desunt. Ordo Odarum in mss. diuersus est; ego primo loco eas nouem Odas posui, quas ecclesia graeca Psalterio addit; sequuntur reliquae, quae in antiquis mss. inueniuntur.*" "*Inscriptionem ωδαῖ ego addidi; non est in mss.*" It is a prayer of 15 verses and is entitled: Προσευχὴ Μανασσῆ.

As to the origin of the prayer, which Oesterley (*op. cit.*, p. 405 ff.) discusses at some length, he comes to the conclusion: "We are inclined to believe that this prayer was not originally composed in reference to Manasseh and that the title, together

with the words 'I have set up abominations and have multiplied detestable things,' was added later and thus made to refer to Manasseh, this having been done under the influence of the numerous legends concerning this king which seem to have been current."

Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, p. 165) is very definite when he says: "Als zweifellos hat zu gelten, dass das 'Gebet Manasses' nicht aus alten Quellen und aus der Zeit des Manasse stammen und von ihm verfasst sein kann."

"There can be no sort of doubt that the writer of this prayer was a Pharisee, and, moreover, one of the best type; the spirit of true religion breathes through it, and it can only have been written by one who was truly religious." (Oesterley, *op. cit.*, p. 410.) Cf. Charles, *op. cit.*, p. 612.

There is some doubt as to the original language of this prayer. Such scholars as Charles, Oesterley, and Kautzsch favor the idea that Hebrew was the original language. Cf. Charles, *op. cit.*, p. 614; Pauly-Wissowa, p. 1613.

Oesterley (*op. cit.*, p. 410) says: "The Judaism which the Prayer reflects is of the Palestinian type, and being a prayer, one would expect it to have been originally written in Hebrew, the 'holy tongue.' The Greek form in which we now possess this composition does not, it is true, read like a translation excepting here and there (*e. g.*, v. 7, where Charles thinks a 'real piece of evidence on behalf of a Semitic original' is to be found); but, as Ball points out, 'the writer may have taken pains to soften down the harshness of a baldly literal translation.' Where linguistic indications do not give definite clues, we must be guided by other considerations; the writer being a Jew of the orthodox Palestinian type, it is hard to believe that he would have composed a prayer in any other language than that in which he had always been accustomed to pray; and set forms of prayer, like the one before us, would have been written in Hebrew, not in Aramaic."

Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, p. 166) seems to fight for a Greek original, for he says: "Was Ball sonst noch geltend macht, um die Existenz eines hebraeischen Originals zu erweisen, sind unbewiesene Behauptungen. Denn es ist viel leichter begreiflich, dass ein juedischer Schriftsteller, der sein Griechisch ganz gut kannte (wie sich dies tatsaechlich aus einigen sprachlichen Eigentuemlichkeiten schliessen laesst) und der die Schnitzer und Unebenheiten der andern Uebersetzer vermied, ein solches Gebet frei von sich aus verfasste, als dass er bei einer Uebersetzung sich so frei bewegt haette, dass kundige Beurteiler wie Fritzsche trotz einzelner Hebraismen, wie sie uebrigens der gesamten juedisch-griechischen

Literatur eigen sind, doch den Eindruck gewannen, dass hier ein griechisches Original vorliege."

As he considers the teaching of this prayer as a basis for his conclusion as to the date of this tract, or prayer, Oesterley (*op. cit.*, p. 410) says: "Some time between B. C. 100—50 seems as likely a date as any."

Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, p. 167) says: "Vielleicht wurde der Busspsalm, gleich zahlreichen andern apokryphischen Stuecken, in der Makkabaeerzeit verfasst zu dem Zweck, um den Juden den Gedanken nahezulegen, dass Busse auch das juedische Volk aus seiner schweren, wenngleich wohlverdienten, Not befreien koenne. Gegen diese zeitliche Ansetzung laesst sich nicht einwenden, dass das Gebet erst nach Jahrhunderten — zuerst in den *Constitutiones Apostolorum* — erwaeht wird; denn man kann nicht erwarten, dass es viel Veranlassung gab, Stellen aus einem so kurzen Literaturwerke von wenig auffallendem Inhalte zu zitieren, darf also auch aus der spaeteren Erwaehnung nicht den Schluss ziehen, dass fruehere christliche Schriftsteller es nicht gekannt haetten."

As to the place where this prayer was composed nothing definite can be stated.

Bibliography

Wace, II, pp. 361-371.

Nestle, *Septuagintastudien*, II, p. 6 ff. (1899).

Kautzsch, I, pp. 161-171.

Charles, I, pp. 612-624.

Oesterley, pp. 404, 410.

Swete, *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, p. 142 (1900).

Fritzsche, *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apogryphen des Alten Testaments*, I, p. 158 ff.

ADDITIONS TO ESTHER

The additions to the canonical Book of Esther supply it with a preface and with a conclusion and expand the narrative in several places.

Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, p. 193 f.) gives us this description of the additions to Esther: "So wird uns in ihnen der Wortlaut der im Buche Esther erwaehten koeniglichen Edikte mitgeteilt; sowohl des von Haman erlassenen, das die Ausrottung der Juden anbefiehlt, als auch des durch Mardachai erlassenen, wonach die Juden ihre Feinde toeten sollen. Ferner werden uns die Gebete des Mardachai und der Esther mitgeteilt, die uns die Gedanken schildern, welche diese beiden in der kritischen Zeit bewegten, wo sich Esther auf Mardachais Zureden hin entschlossen hat, zum Koenige zu gehen, und es werden zugleich die naeheren Umstaende eingehend geschildert, unter denen sich das fuer Esther so gefahr-

volle, aber auch von so schoenem Erfolge begleitete Erscheinen vor dem Koenige vollzog. Schliesslich wird noch von einem Traum erzahlt, den Mardachai hatte noch ehe die im Buche Esther berichteten Begebenheiten begonnen hatten, sich zu ereignen, und am Schlusse des Ganzen wird auf Grund dieser Begebenheiten eine Deutung des Traumes gegeben. Auch ist von einer andern, und zwar weit frueheren, Verschwuerung zweier Eunuchen und von ihrer Entdeckung durch Mardachai die Rede. Diese sieben (oder nach anderer Zaehlung, die den Traum als Einleitung nicht mitzaehlt, nur sechs) Erzählungsstuecke sind je an dem Ort eingefuegt, wohin sie ihrem Inhalte nach gehoeren: das 1. Stueck, der Traum des Mardachai samt der Entdeckung der Verschwuerung, vor 1:1; das 2. Stueck, das Edikt des Haman, nach 3:13; das 3. Stueck, das Gebet des Mardachai, nach 4:17; das 4. Stueck, das Gebet der Esther, im Anschlusse hieran, also ebenfalls nach 4:17; das 5. Stueck, das Erscheinen der Esther vor dem Koenige, an Stelle von 5:1 f.; das 6. Stueck, das Edikt des Mardachai, an Stelle von 8:13; und das 7. Stueck, die Deutung des Traums samt der Einfuehrung des Festes, nach 10:3."

In Rahlfs's edition of the Septuagint the additions to Esther are marked by adding the letters a, b, c, etc., to the verses which are added.

Oesterley, in his discussion of the Additions to Esther, gives us a brief description of the contents of the canonical Book of Esther and then says: "It was necessary to give this outline of the contents of the canonical Book of Esther in order to show the point of the additions in the Septuagint; for as found in the English Apocrypha, the additions are taken together and treated as one whole; but by being thus separated from their contexts their *raison d'être* is not seen. In the Septuagint the additions form elaborations of certain passages of the canonical Esther; so that in order to see the object of the additions, each must be considered from the point of view of its original position." (*Op. cit.*, p. 400.)

In Luther's translation the additions to Esther are also taken as a whole. They are, however, not added as Esther 10:4 to 16:24, as in the English Apocrypha; they rather follow the chapter number of their own.

In the Septuagint the first addition precedes chapter 1 of canonical Esther and thus takes the form of an introduction to the whole story. It tells of a dream of Mordecai, which he interpreted as a revelation of a conspiracy against the king. By his efforts the conspirators are apprehended and executed. The object of the addition is to show why Mordecai was advanced in the court of Artaxerxes (Ahasuerus).—The second addition follows Esther 3:13. This purports to give verbatim the letter com-

manding the massacre of the Jews, which was sent by Artaxerxes to the governors of the provinces. The object of this addition is evidently to emphasize the peril in which the Jews were owing to the machinations of Haman. — The next addition follows Esther 4:17 and is a prayer to God for deliverance from the danger threatened by the king's decree. This is a prayer of Mordecai. — Then, after a short section in which we are told that Israel also prayed, we find the prayer of Esther, immediately following that of Mordecai. Of these prayers Oesterley (*op. cit.*, p. 402) says: "The object of this addition is obvious; it is that the utter lack of religion in the canonical book should be made good; as is well known, the name of God does not occur a single time in the canonical Esther." — The fifth addition of Esther follows immediately after the preceding one and is an elaboration of Esther 5:1 ff., which verses are omitted from the LXX. It recounts in detail Esther's appearance before the king for the purpose of inviting him to the banquet which is mentioned in Esther 5:3. — The next addition is found following Esther 8:12. It claims to give the contents of the letter of Artaxerxes (cf. Esther 8:8 ff.) written to revoke the order given in the former letter. — The seventh and last addition to Esther is added to the canonical book of Esther at the end. It contains the interpretations of the dream of Mordecai given as the first addition.

"That the author or, perhaps more probably, the authors of these additions were Hellenistic Jews is sufficiently clear from the whole tone of them," says Oesterley, *op. cit.*, p. 403.

As to the author or authors Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, p. 197) says: "Mag nun aber der Verfasser der Zusaetze mit dem Uebersetzer des hebraeischen Estherbuchs identisch oder von ihm verschieden sein, so ist doch so viel sicher, dass zu seiner Zeit bereits ein reiches Material muendlicher oder auch schriftlicher 'Estherlegende' vorhanden war, das er fuer die Abfassung seiner Zusaetze verwerten konnte, und dass wir deshalb diese literarisch selbstaendigen groesseren griechischen Zusaetze in stofflicher Hinsicht zum Teil doch nur als einen Niederschlag des damals vorliegenden Materials an Esther-Haggada anzusehen haben."

As to the original language of these additions Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, p. 194) says: "Es kann nun keinem Zweifel unterliegen, dass die fruehste schriftliche Fassung der Estherlegende [?] das hebraeische Buch Esther ist und dass die griechischen Zusaetze, die in der LXX stehen, die aeltesten und einfachsten Erweiterungen des hebraeischen Buches darstellen. . . . Wir werden dadurch zugleich in den Stand gesetzt, einer Annahme entgegenzutreten, die bis in die Gegenwart herein, besonders von katholischen Theologen . . ., ausgestellt worden ist, dass naemlich den griechischen

Zusätzen ein hebraeisches oder aramaeisches Original zugrunde liege. Diese Annahme scheitert jedoch schon daran, dass diese hebraeischen und aramaeischen Texte, wie sich zeigen wird, sehr spaeten Ursprungs sind und sich umgekehrt als weitere Ausschmueckungen der in den griechischen Zusätzen vorliegenden Gestalt der Estherlegende [?] vorliegen." — We naturally cannot identify ourselves with Kautzsch's negative higher criticism.

The question as to the date of these additions to Esther is answered by Kautzsch (*op. cit.*, p. 196) in the following manner: "Wann aber wurden diese griechischen Stuecke verfasst? Als *terminus ad quem* der Abfassung hat die Zeit des Josephus zu gelten, der fuer die Estherzusätze ebenso wie fuer den apokryphischen Esra der aelteste Zeuge ist, der aber, wie hier nur beilaeufig bemerkt sei, noch manches andere einmischt, was die palestinensische Haggada in das Buch Esther hineingedichtet hatte (s. weiteres bei B. Jakob in der *Zeitschrift fuer alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, X, 1890, S. 262—266 und S. 295 ff.). Nun bietet zwar scheinbar eine Notiz, die uns in das Jahr 114 v. Chr. weist (S. u. S. 212), eine ganz bestimmte Angabe ueber die Zeit der Abfassung; aber sie bezieht sich auf das ganze Buch, sofern dieses nach 9:20 des hebraeischen Textes als 'Brief' des Mardachai an die Juden angesehen wird, und somit kann die Unterschrift nicht als Zeugnis fuer das Alter der eingeschobenen Stuecke verwendet werden. Auch verdient sie an sich so wenig Glauben, dass es ebensowenig erlaubt ist, die Uebersetzung des ganzen Buches Esther danach fixieren zu wollen. Betreffs dieser ergibt sich aus inneren Gruenden, wie B. Jakob (a. a. O., S. 274—290) eingehend nachgewiesen hat, dass sie aegyptische Verhaeltnisse und Einrichtungen sowie aegyptisch-griechisches Sprachgefuehl so deutlich widerspiegelt, dass sie in Aegypten verfasst sein muss (wodurch die Angabe der Unterschrift, dass sie aus Palaestina stamme, als falsch erwiesen wird). Danach ergibt sich fuer uns als *terminus ad quem* das Jahr 30 v. Chr., in welchem die Ptolemaeerherrschaft fuer alle Zeit ein Ende nahm. Da jedoch dem griechischen Uebersetzer des Buches Jesus Sirach im 38. Jahre des Ptolemaeus Euergetes II. (der nach jetzt allgemeiner Annahme gemeint sein muss), d. i., im Jahre 132 v. Chr., der groesste Teil des dreigetheilten hebraeischen Kanons bereits im Griechischen vorgelegen haben muss, so wird auch die Uebersetzung des Buches Esther noch vor 132 v. Chr. entstanden sein, weil bei der Beliebtheit dieses Buches angenommen werden muss, dass es sehr bald nach dem Pentateuch, der von allen Buechern zuerst uebersetzt wurde, auch seinerseits ins Griechische uebertragen worden ist."

"As to the date at which the additions were made there is nothing in the additions themselves which offers any clue; but

a book, such as the canonical Esther, in which a wonderful deliverance of the Jews is recorded, would be especially welcome to the people during a time of stress and anxiety; and if, at a time when such a book might well have been eagerly sought after, patriotic Jews should have enhanced its lesson of hope and encouragement by adding explanatory details, such a procedure would have been in the highest degree natural. There is but one period of stress and anxiety that can come into consideration here, and that is the time of the Maccabean struggle; so we conclude that these additions must have been made during the latter half of the second century B. C." (Oesterley, *op. cit.*, p. 403.)

Bibliography

- Josephus, *Antiquities*, XI, vi.
 Fritzsche, in *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des Alten Testaments* (1851).
 Schuerer, II, iii, pp. 181—183.
 Scholz, *Kommentar ueber das Buch Esther mit seinen Zusaetzen* (1892).
 Cornill, pp. 262, 263 (1896).
 Jakob, "Das Buch Esther bei den LXX," in *Zeitschrift fuer alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* (1890), p. 241 ff.
 Swete, pp. 257—259.
 Kautzsch, I, p. 193 ff.
 Charles, pp. 665—685.
 Oesterley, pp. 398—403.
 Austin, Tex.

K. G. MANZ



Outlines on the Wuertemberg Gospel Selections

Seventeenth Sunday after Trinity

John 9:1-7

It is a truth often expressed in the Scriptures that God's children must endure affliction here on earth. "We must through much tribulation," etc., Acts 14:22. "Whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth," Heb. 12:6. "Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake," Matt. 5:10, a statement preparing the minds of the disciples for suffering of the gravest kind.

The Christian religion offers the greatest riches, earned for us by Christ: forgiveness of sins, peace of heart, a place in heaven. All this is bestowed free of charge; it merely has to be taken; it is laid hold of not through our paying of a price but through faith. But the Christian religion does not promise that its adherents will not have to suffer here on earth; it foretells them the very opposite. The Scriptures are right: pain, disease, disappointments, business troubles, beset the paths of Christians. It is important that we have the right view of tribulations when they come upon us and our fellow-Christians. Our text contains several important lessons on

The Tribulations of God's Children

1. *They are not necessarily the result of specific sins*
2. *They are intended to glorify God*

1

The text tells of a sufferer, a person born blind, subsisting on alms. Evidently he was a believing Israelite, waiting for God to fulfil the Messianic prophecies. The disciples of Jesus were touched by his misery. The question arose in their minds, Whose sin was responsible for his affliction, his own or that of his parents?

The disciples took the view that special suffering is a result of some particular sin, v. 2. It was hard to conceive how this man might have sinned in a special way before his birth; if not he, then, so they think, his parents must have committed some special wrong.

That suffering is due to the existence of sin in the world that, if there were no sin, there would be no anguish, no sorrow, is of course true. Cf. Gen. 3. The disciples, however, thought they could go farther and trace unusual suffering back to some uncommon act of transgression. We, too, are prone to engage in reasoning of this nature, especially if the brother struck by disaster has in some way hurt our sensibilities.

We cannot deny that there are instances related in the Bible

where God's children brought suffering upon themselves by some special sin. David's infant son, born of an adulterous union, died. The father had repented of his crime, but he must suffer. Similarly, a plague visited David's nation when he in a sinful way had numbered the people. Cf. 2 Sam. 24. David had gone to the Lord for forgiveness, but the plague was not averted. This is a moral universe, it has been said. Wrong-doing is followed by suffering. Cf. what negligence often leads to.

But now note that in our text Jesus clearly teaches that it is wrong to hold special suffering to be always the result of some particular violation of the divine Law. Cf. v. 3. We must, then, be careful in our judgment as to what caused the affliction of a fellow-Christian. An auto accident is not a proof that the occupants transgressed some special law. Business reverses are not necessarily the fruit of dishonest dealing. Cf. Luke 13:1-5.

When we ourselves are visited by adversity, we must not at once conclude that we have offended God in some extraordinary manner. If there has been specific wrong-doing, let us repent. If not, then let us humble ourselves nevertheless, remembering that we are sinful beings; but let us say, too, that the affliction may have its source in something else than some specific wrong-doing, and that God's purpose is not a vindictive one.

2

Jesus throws light on the cause of this man's blindness. God had permitted it to come in order that His glory might be made manifest through the miracle which Jesus was to perform. At the time when this man was born God had long ago determined how the sufferer was to be helped and blessed. Through the healing of this man Christ's divine power, His deity, His Messiahship were to be revealed.

The miracle which Jesus performed on this occasion was most remarkable. It is one of the few which John relates, all of them extraordinary manifestations of divine power and goodness.

Here is one of the great lessons God teaches us concerning our tribulations. Through our crosses God purposes to manifest His glory. Joseph is sold into Egypt. God permits it. But think of His beneficent design: Joseph was to be raised to unexpected heights and to become the benefactor of a large part of the world. Cf. Gen. 50:20. "What a mighty, wise, and loving ruler our God is!" we exclaim.

There are many other instances like that of Joseph, where God in striking fashion sends deliverance. Think of the case of Peter, Acts 12. Often, however, His course is different. He permits the cross to remain. But here, too, the "works of God are to be made manifest." The Christian that bears his affliction cheerfully

thereby shows that he has a God who can comfort and strengthen him in woe and anguish.

And even when a Christian's affliction is due to some specific wrong-doing, of which he, however, has repented, some carelessness in business, some act of neglect or overindulgence, he is not to regard it as a punishment, but as a paternal visitation, intended for his eternal welfare, Heb. 12:6. Even in such a case the Christian should pray that through his patience in cross-bearing the glory of his God and Savior may become manifest. May the lesson of 2 Cor. 12:9 f. always be before our mind. W. ARNDT

Eighteenth Sunday after Trinity

John 9:24-39

The great miracle by which a man born blind had his sight restored, caused a great stir in Jerusalem. The persistent enemies of Jesus sought ways and means to counteract the effect of this miracle. They examined the blind man's parents, they questioned the man himself. And they found that the miracle was performed on a Sabbath. But they could not shake the faith of the happy man. In contrast with this faith we see the blind, wilfully blind, unbelief of Christ's enemies which occasioned the peculiar comment of Jesus, v. 39.

Faith in Contrast to Unbelief

1. *Faith brings clearer vision*
2. *Unbelief leads to darker blindness*

1

Vv. 24 and 25. The man that was blind clings to the fact that now he can see. From this fact he draws his conclusions. The person who performed this unheard-of miracle cannot be a sinner, as the leaders would have him admit. Such a miracle can be done only by one whom God favors, vv. 30-33. His vision becomes clearer as the nagging questioning continues. The man that gave him physical sight must be holy, a worshiper of God, v. 31, must do the will of God, and be of God. He also sees that his questioners, who pride themselves on being Moses' disciples, who are the recognized teachers of the Jews, the custodians of the Law of Moses, are altogether in error in regard to the man who healed him. Rather than give up his conviction, he suffers excommunication, v. 34.

And finally, when Jesus reveals Himself as the Son of God, the promised Messiah, he worships Him, honors Him as he would honor God, vv. 35-38. Wonderful progress in vision.

Faith in Christ as your divine Redeemer brings you clearer vision of various essential truths. What wise philosophers,

psychologists, fail to see, what even world-famous theologians refuse to recognize, the total depravity of human nature, the complete enslavement of man's reason, will, and emotions—your faith opens your eyes to see it.

Again, many of the wise, even in the visible Church, fail to see the spirit of the Law, they are blind to the fact that God's Law demands perfection, that our righteousness must be better than the righteousness of the Pharisees. And because of this blindness they are speaking of salvation by character, by the works of the Law.

But faith brings clearer vision, the believer sees: Ps. 14:3; Eccl. 7:20; Is. 64:6, etc.; he sees the real purpose of the Law, Rom. 3:29; 7:7; therefore Gal. 2:16.

Many, even theological teachers, see in Jesus only a wise Rabbi, nothing more. Faith sees His glory as of the only-begotten Son of God, full of grace and truth, John 1:14. Explanation of the Second Article. And finally faith will bring us face to face with our Savior; then we shall see Him as He is. Indeed, faith brings to us an ever clearer vision.

2

In contrast to faith unbelief leads to darker blindness. We have an example in our text.

The blind leaders of Israel wilfully disregard a fact, the great miracle of Jesus. They fail to see, or refuse to recognize, the conclusions to be drawn from this fact. Their hatred of Christ, their pride in their position as teachers of the Law of Moses, their unbelief, leads them into deeper blindness. They fail to see the helping, saving, life-giving hand of grace held out to them in Jesus; in stupid blindness they lead themselves and their nation into disaster and ruin; finally even the possibility of being enlightened is lost forever.

Alas, these blind leaders have many followers. The unbelief of the so-called Modernists, who rob Christ of His deity and of His glory of Redeemership, makes them blind to obvious facts. They endeavor to make this world better by preaching a shallow morality and fail to see that their patient, the world, sinks deeper into sin and corruption. Under their leadership selfishness, cruelty, hatred, godlessness, wantonness, the pursuit of lustful joys, etc., grow apace. Their unbelief leads them into ever-growing blindness, so that what our merciful God has ordained for their salvation becomes utter foolishness to them.

Thus in their blindness they have set themselves and all who follow them on the road to the impenetrable darkness of hell.

Oh, that we tremblingly heed the solemn warning of Jesus, v. 39!

H. J. BOUMAN

Nineteenth Sunday after Trinity

Luke 7:36-50

The great central doctrine of salvation by the free grace of God through faith in Christ has ever been criticized as depriving men of any incentive to good works, aye, of actually putting a premium on sin, Rom. 3:8; 6:1. — St. Paul effectually refutes this charge and shows that the very opposite is true, viz., that this very truth of the Gospel furnishes the only true incentive for devoted service of Christ. — The beautiful Gospel text for this Sunday also teaches this fact.

Forgiving Grace the Only True Incentive for Devoted Service of Christ

This is clearly demonstrated

1. *By the example of Simon, the Pharisee*
2. *By the example of the penitent woman*

1

A) Simon's coldness. a) In the sight of men — and his own — Simon was a respectable person, ranking far above that sinful woman. She a great debtor, he a much lesser, if one at all. — b) Over against Christ, Simon is cold and indifferent. While indeed he had invited Jesus to his house, yet his entire conduct was utterly devoid of any affection for his divine Guest. In fact, he failed to accord him the common amenities of the times, vv. 44—46.

B) Tactfully, yet clearly and convincingly, Jesus points out the reason for this coldness, v. 47b. Simon had not experienced forgiving grace. "Little," i. e., nothing, had been forgiven him (there is no "little," or partial, forgiveness). In fact, the proud Pharisee felt no need of grace and of a Savior such as Jesus had come into the world to be. — Indeed, the Savior's grace was freely offered to all alike. But Simon, the Pharisee, haughtily spurned grace, resented the very thought that he was in need of it. Hence he loved "little," had no true love at all. All his seeming piety was not acceptable service of God and Christ but revealed a cold, mercenary attitude, designed to obligate God, to merit salvation. Why should he, from his point of view, love Jesus and devotedly serve Him? There was no true incentive without experience of forgiving grace.

C) *Application.* — The case of Simon is that of every sinner that lacks the true incentive of forgiving grace, the case of modern Pharisees with their much-vaunted righteousness. Apply above to them.

But let us look into our own hearts and to the oft glaring weak-

nesses of many professed Christians, to the coldness and indifference with respect to service of Christ. As Simon failed to accord Jesus even the usual courtesies extended honored guests, so we must note much weakness in the performance of most obvious acts of Christian service (attendance at public worship, contributions for Christ's kingdom and charities, self-denial, sacrifice, etc.).—All this should raise in our hearts the concerned question: Do we fully realize what Christ and His forgiving grace means to us? Are we fully aware that it spells the difference between eternal perdition and eternal life? Absence of this incentive accounts for every failure to render Christ that loving, grateful service which He rightly seeks in all for whom He died and rose again.

2

The example of the penitent woman the positive evidence.

A) Describe her devoted service. It was a costly service to anoint Jesus with precious fragrant perfume. Her entire conduct without words indeed expressive of complete humble devotion. There was nothing too good for Jesus that she would not give, no service too great that she would not render.

B) What incentive prompted such devoted service?

a) It was certainly not the expectation to merit forgiveness. The words of Jesus, v. 47a, cannot in this setting be thus interpreted. Obviously, forgiveness of her sins anteceded her service of grateful love and constituted the cause of her devotion.—The parable, vv. 41, 42, so clearly shows remission to be the antecedent cause and love the consequent effect that even Simon unhesitatingly judges rightly, v. 43.—Furthermore, in direct application of the parable the words of Jesus, v. 47, clearly present the woman's great love as evidence of the fact that she had experienced forgiving grace. The "for" = ground of knowledge, *Erkenntnisgrund*. Finally, the expectation of meriting forgiveness had been contrary to all Scripture, Rom. 3:23 ff.; Eph. 2:8.

b) No, the one impelling incentive was the forgiving grace of Jesus.—A notorious, vile sinner indeed, the woman had evidently heard of Jesus, whose fame filled the land. What she had heard of Him, perhaps directly and personally, had aroused her conscience to the vileness of her sin, filled her heart with fear of the righteous wrath of God. All the more eagerly and hopefully she had heard the precious Gospel-message proclaimed by Jesus and His gracious invitation "Come unto Me," Matt. 11:28. She had heard of His kindness to sinners. Through Jesus she felt assured of gracious forgiveness of all her sins. This glorious experience filled her heart with love of Him who had stood between her and eternal ruin, to

whom she owed all her new-found happiness. How she welcomed the opportunity now to give expression to her love and render devoted service, not here only in the house of Simon but throughout her life, strengthened as she was by the sealing of forgiveness in the precious assurance: vv. 48, 50. The same forgiving grace has ever been the incentive for saints of God. Paul's matchless zeal accounted for by his rejoicing: "I obtained mercy!" 1 Tim. 1:16. John and his hearers declare: "We love Him because He first loved us," 1 John 4:19.

C) *Application*. — Not Sinai but Calvary furnishes the one divinely powerful incentive for devoted service of Christ. Over against all modern pharisaism, in view of our own weakness, let us look more intently to the Cross of Christ. This alone, this surely, will strengthen us and fill us with greater zeal, and at every opportunity of service we shall say with Paul: "The love of Christ constraineth us," 2 Cor. 5:14. — Hymn 351:2. AUGUST F. BERNTHAL

Twentieth Sunday after Trinity

Luke 18:1-8

All things work according to fixed laws of nature which nothing can change, says the false scientist.

All things in our lives are determined by fate, and whatever is to happen will happen, is the claim of the unbelieving fatalist. If that were true, prayer would be useless and foolish.

But our Lord is wiser than the scientist and the fatalist; He tells us to pray.

Continue in Prayer

1. *This is what God expects of us*
2. *This has the promise of being heard*

1

A) The context: Jesus had spoken about terrible times preceding the return of Christ, Luke 17:26-29. Preparation for such times consists in persistent prayer. That is the Christian's defense program in critical times.

How applicable to our own day! The world is in a state of chaos. Many of the greatest gifts of mankind, scientific discoveries, the conquest of many forces of nature, the great inventions, education, — all are being used in an effort to destroy human beings to a degree such as the world has never seen. War times are always times of special temptation to the greatest moral laxity; a spirit of godless indifference then rules the masses.

B) For such an age our parable presents God's encouragement: *Continue* in prayer. So many factors in this parable stress this need of *continuing* in prayer: The widow is one who *keeps on coming* (imperfect ἥρχετο); she troubled the judge; her persistent pleading is such that the judge calls it a continual coming which wearies him. (Original as much as "beats my eyes black and blue with her demands.") And of His elect Jesus says that they "cry day and night unto Him." Cf. Rom. 15:30 ("strive"), Col. 4:12 ("laboring").

C) Thus God wants us to be persistent in prayer. Too often this is neglected. If God does not hear a prayer at once in the manner in which we expect, or if He has in reality heard a prayer and we are merely too blind to realize it, we draw the conclusion that praying for a certain gift is of no use. This is a false conclusion; we should continue in prayer, plead, repeat, wrestle with God.

2

A) The persistent prayer of the widow in this text was heard. The judge, moved by her continued pleading, avenged her. The Lord adds: "I tell you that He will avenge them speedily."

God has shown so many times in Scripture that He will hear prayer as He has promised. David's prayer against Ahitophel, 2 Sam. 15:31; Jesus' prayer for Peter that his faith fail not was fulfilled when this man became a staunch apostle, Luke 22:32.

B) We have the promise of God that He will hear our prayer, Jas. 1:5. Human reason would argue against the hearing of prayer and ascribe all to chance. The Christian may indeed not always see the granting of his desires, but as a Christian he has the privilege of believing that his prayer is heard.

At times God may delay His answer: "Though He bear long with them." Paul's desire to depart and be with Christ (Phil. 1:23) was not granted for about seven years. The prophets of the Old Testament who prayed for the coming of the Messiah died in a hope which was not realized until many centuries later. So we may pray for things in youth which are finally granted in old age. As Christians we believe that in His manner and at His time God will hear all prayer.

Our age is an age of staggering calamities. Men's hearts are failing them for fear and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth. In such times the Christian seeks refuge in prayer, persistent prayer, and he has the promise of the Father's almighty help.

H. O. A. KEINATH



Miscellanea

The Preaching of Repentance and Conversion

At our Seminary chapel morning devotion recently our dean urgently presented the need of a more direct preaching of repentance in our Synod. Especially did he wrestle with the consciences of our young theological candidates whether or not they actually were intending to be such preachers. He pleaded with them to search their own souls whether they were living in a daily experience of sin and grace and thus were able to preach repentance to others. "Some of you," he said, "may need to experience conversion." He spoke of times of great "spiritual awakening" in the long gone past, "even here in this Mississippi Valley region." Only a heart of stone could have remained untouched by this appeal.

I remember once how a pastor of our Synod, now departed from this life, argued with me whether there might not come a time when such preaching would no more be necessary. I replied: "Yes indeed, when there are no more sinners needing conversion." Are there others who belong to that category of preachers still?

Somehow the direct, keen, Scripturally illumining pulpit messages of conversion, deep, strong, probing, have decreased even in our Synod. I do not imagine that by so saying I will, as in years back, be brought before the ministerium for asking (it was in 1922) whether there was adequate indoctrination going on! When the truth exists, it can and must be expressed, whatever the result. I have long felt that the conversion element has diminished. Earnest, experienced Christians of our Synod are constantly concerned about this matter. Should not we all?

What Sermons Sometimes Lack

It is not that sermons do not touch on the need of another life. Not that they do not speak of a saving Savior. But the *point* is often lacking. Do you know anything about a real conversion? Are you converted? Do you live in a daily conversion? And then that so bitterly often wanting element in much sermonizing: *How shall a sinner come to conversion?*

That "how," so clear in the Scriptures and in Lutheran preaching of the past (and present in part), is the crux. "How?" To tell the "how" is the problem. That calls for experience in grace, in Word, in zeal for soul's conversion, and not only for church-membership and church activity. These latter can exist in the Lutheran Church as in all denominations, even in pagan religions. I wonder if the unending reading of modernized Reformed sermon literature and theology has not sadly depleted the pulpit messages even in American Lutheranism. No doubt it accounts for a great deal. The "way of salvation," that Reformation jewel, almost belongs to a forgotten experience; is it not so? The preaching may be so general, so "pleasant" for the unconverted, who hate the message of conversion, that the pastor modifies the strenuous

point, the crucial turn, the troublesome question, the difficult doctrine to be set forth, unless the preacher himself has a clear experience of sin and grace.

What a time and age of possibilities for preachers of repentance! If we miss that opportunity today, what will happen to the Church when the aftermath of the World War comes? One trembles to think. Therefore we rejoice when we hear preaching and teaching which is clear, doctrinally lucid, and Spirit-empowered. And that we do hear, even in our Synod.

Indoctrination and Conversion Related

There was mention made above of "adequate indoctrination." Oh, how closely this stands related to the preaching of repentance! The Reformation, Pietism, the nineteenth-century deep spiritual conversions, and local similar phenomena of today find indoctrination and conversion twinned. Even on the radios we note that fact. It cannot be otherwise. An Eastern theological seminary, Lutheran, has lately sent out a questionnaire to other Lutheran seminaries as to the spiritual life of the theological students. That is timely. They might also have included: What about the knowledge of the Word of God and a living, vital, clear, pulsating grasp of the "way of salvation" in its fulness? What of a consistent presentation of conversion in true setting?

Lay Christians of our Synod, encourage your pastor when he preaches a full salvation, even clearly emphasizes and *explains* conversion. Remember, the worldly (and we have many such among us) dislike pertinent Scripture-messages. They enjoy "soft" things, "interesting" sermons, pretty messages, or it may be some craven oratory (a scant article in our body, and just as well). Be a wall of fire about your pastor. He has many tribulations that he never publicly mentions precisely as to this matter of preaching a sharp, clean-cut, clear message of repentance—the "great conversion" and the "daily conversion."

Baptism Grace and Daily Repentance

Possibly, if a more clear relation between Baptism and a daily repentance were brought out more definitely in doctrine and instruction as in pulpit, help could be given to many souls. And, remember, if the message fails for some years of life, the "good seed" of the Word may in later years spring up and bear glorious fruit. That sowing in hope is the secret joy of the true conversion preacher. His face will radiate with joy when once he has been "homed" above.

Take courage, you young pastors of the pulpit! And grow not weary, you my elder brethren, in that charge! But preach more clearly the Scriptural doctrine of repentance. Let us remind each other of this, you me, as I you. And you, our dear folks of the pew, keep us awake! If we grow lax, remind us. That used to be a virtue and is Scripturally called for. Should we become weak and flaccid doctrinally, pray for us; but also find a way to stimulate us to stronger Biblical and doctrinal solidity, meatiness, consistent clarity, and fidelity to our Reformation creed which we have confessed and on which we even once were ordained. Note St. Paul's beautiful and modest apostolic

desire for mutual exchange of spiritual gifts between himself and his lay friends in Rome (Rom. 1:11). That from the mightiest spiritual mind of all ages!

What if we all studied more the Lutheran "old-fashioned books" (as the meager-minded of our day pleurably style them)? We could then be more spiritually serviceable for our present day and certainly then also more definitely futuristic and ahead of our own crumbling, defeated, pessimistic, and tottering time. I voraciously read the ultra-modern literature. But just therefore I see so clearly its doom-nature and its inescapable advancing tribulations. God is one. His truth is one. His way to be saved is one. Sin changes only its clothes, never its nature in the sight of God. When we well know the Lord in the past, we can be equally certain of our Lord for our day and for the coming future. Two things never change: sin and Christ. Therefore, too, we need sharp preaching of conversion, in its full Biblical content, relations, and meaning, even if its vocabulary be guardedly different.

Ever and forever into the tremendous Scriptural clarity on conversion! That "psychological approach" sinners of our day have not been able to modify in such a way as pleasantly to save themselves from sin and guilt.

The peace of Christ come to us and abide with us!

DR. A. HULT, in the *Lutheran Companion*

Gegen die Evolutionstheorie

Die Anthropologie (Lehre vom Menschen) hat nach mancherlei Umwegen zu früheren Auffassungen zurückgefunden. Bald nach der Jahrhundertwende hat der Breslauer Prof. Klaatsch schwerwiegende Einwände gegen Darwin und Haeckel erhoben und nachgewiesen, daß sowohl die fünffingerige Hand des Menschen als auch sein überaus urtümliches harmonisches Gebiß Bildungen sind, die den entsprechenden der Menschenaffen gegenüber nicht als Abstümmungsformen gedeutet werden dürfen. Prof. Edgar Daque in München faßt das Ergebnis paläontologischer Befunde zum Weltbild der Stammesgeschichte in die Sätze zusammen: „Je reicher das Material zuzug und je gründlicher es vergleichend anatomisch studiert werden konnte, um so mehr zeigte es sich, daß von gradlinig und harmonisch sich entwickelnden Stammreihen nirgends etwas zu finden ist. Alles löst sich in eigene Typen- und Formenkreise auf. Das gewöhnliche Stammbaumbild, wie es durch die klassische Deszendenz- oder Abstammungslehre vorausgesetzt wurde, hat sich nirgends entdecken lassen.“ Dr. Herbert Fritzsche, der in der „Woche“ über den heutigen Stand der Wissenschaft berichtet, schließt: „Der Mensch als Eigenlinie und, recht verstanden, als sein eigener Vorfahr steht heute als der große Universalist vor uns. Er steht der Tierheit gegenüber. . . . Er ist wieder zur Mitte der Schöpfung geworden und damit auch zum zentralen Sinn alles lebendigen Werdens. Weder ist er ein enthaarter Schimpanse noch der geschlechtsreif gewordene Affenembryo der Darwinschen Ära, sondern er ist ein Eigener, ein dem Herzen der Schöpfung nahe gebliebenes Kind.“ (Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung, 21. Febr. 1941.)

Theological Observer — *Ärkebischof-Zeitgeschichtliches*

Minnesota District of the American Lutheran Church Insists on Confessional Loyalty.—The *Lutheran Standard* of June 21 reports on the meeting of the Minnesota District of the American Lutheran Church. A few paragraphs from that report, since they are of special interest to members of the Missouri Synod, should be quoted here.

"Dr. Poppen's emphasis on certain points in his address on 'The State of the Church' was noted. A lively discussion followed on the Synod's relationship to the American Lutheran Conference, especially as it affected the position of the Minnesota District. The District favors some form of immediate action. The District greeted with joy the news of the 100th anniversary of the *Lutheran Standard*. Timely papers discussed involved the question, Has unionism a Biblical basis? and the problem of psychology and cure of souls. Rev. R. Lechner in his paper on Unionism replied to the question raised with an emphatic 'No!' Because unionism has as its two chief characteristics indifference to doctrines of Scripture, and separatism, which permits each Church to interpret formulas in a different manner, genuine unionism has no Biblical basis. 'In order to secure unity,' said the essayist, 'each Christian must be willing to sacrifice non-essentials and to submit to the restricting powers of true Christian reality.'" We hope that these earnest men, valiantly contending for the faith once delivered to the saints, will not grow weary in their efforts and that their endeavors will lead to tangible results. A.

The Triumph of Inclusivism.—The term "inclusivism" means about the same thing as our better-known word "unionism." In an editorial the *Christian Beacon* (July 17, 1941), under the heading "Inclusivism," writes the following: "The Triumph of Inclusivism," reproduced from the final issue of *Christianity Today*, which ceased publication for lack of readers, presents a very interesting picture, though not as sharply drawn or as sharply painted as we believe the situation actually to be. However, on the basis of this presentation the picture is dark enough to cause those who truly love the Word of God and the authority of the Bible to come out and be separate from such fellowship. Inclusivism is the binding together of those of opposing views and beliefs in the name of Christ. This the Word of God forbids. The picture of Modernism, Buchmanism, Barthianism, being joined in fellowship about the Communion table with those who would hold the great historic doctrine of the Christian faith just is not in the Bible as a true Christian Church. Inclusivism has brought its peace and harmony. Those who would stand for the intolerance of the Gospel that there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby men must be saved have taken down their banners. The presentation of such a case clearly requires of God's people separation. 'Be not unequally yoked together with unbelievers,' is the command of Scripture. Those who consider themselves faithful ministers of the Word of God find themselves in

a strange predicament. They are face to face with the commands of the Word of God."

One can fully appreciate the import of this editorial only after reading the article "The Triumph of Inclusivism" (by Rev. E. Edwin Paulson, S. T. M.), a truly masterful indictment of the horrible situation in which the Presbyterian Church finds itself after its surrender to Modernism. A few paragraphs will illustrate what we mean: "For more than a quarter of a century a fierce struggle raged within the Presbyterian Church. Unfortunately the issues involved in this conflict have not yet been understood by the rank and file of either the ministers or laymen in our Church. As in the case of political conflicts, the real issues have been largely obscured behind personalities. Instead of examining critically the ideological basis for the difference, it was charged that members of the protesting groups were suffering from temperamental idiosyncrasies, introversion, and other personality maladjustments. Today many of these men are either dead or they have left our Church." "The question was not whether one belonged to the old or new school of Calvinism, although some believed that the conflict had its beginnings in that struggle. It was rather a struggle between those who endorsed the five points of faith, set forth by the Assembly of 1923, as the absolute minimum doctrinal basis for evangelical Christianity and those who by either adhering to, or by tolerating, the tenets of the Auburn Affirmation showed that they refused to be bound by any objective standards of faith." "As we look back on these past few years, it becomes increasingly evident that inclusivism has triumphed even beyond the fondest hopes and expectations of its advocates. This victory for the proponents of inclusivism has resulted, among other things, in the expulsion or voluntary exodus from our Church of many conscientious men and women who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. Such fearless defenders of historic Christianity have been objects of scorn and derision, but history must honor them as those who dared to place principle in precedence to policy, valuing the praise of God above the praise of men." "Many ministers remained within the Church because they felt that they could not desert thousands of true believers who did not, and perhaps could not, grasp the full significance of the subtleties of theological controversy. . . . The sad thing is not that we have remained within a Church which has sinned grievously, but that we have been content to remain silent and have been willing to subscribe to a policy of appeasement which in the end must inevitably rob us of strength or character and any distinctive Christian testimony." "It is true that no one in our denomination is in any direct way hindered in preaching the Gospel. Conservative Calvinists and premillenarian dispensationalists are unquestionably allowed free course in preaching the Gospel in our Church. Equal privileges are afforded those who do not proclaim the vicarious atonement but who preach pleasant-sounding moral essays and a form of sentimental idealism. Truly, a denomination which has espoused a policy of doctrinal latitudinarianism presents an ideal situation to individuals who are churchmen first and theologians secondly. But to men who are intellectually honest and who are troubled with certain conscientious scruples it spells a different

story. Such men know that it would be next to impossible today to convict an individual in our church courts for preaching and teaching heretical doctrines. A man who would dare to institute charges against another minister on doctrinal grounds would only be committing ecclesiastical suicide. There remains but one thing that might be classified as heresy, and that is a failure to support the boards, agencies, and institutions of our denomination. . . . The sinister shadow of totalitarianism surely lurks in such practices, proving that, when men value anything above utter and implicit obedience to the Word of God, they gain not the freedom they anticipate but a *character-deadening, soul-destroying bondage*" (italics our own).

In our own fight against Liberalism as it confronts Lutheranism in the present church-union movement (in which we desire no other union than one based on true church unity) there are several facts which may easily be forgotten by us just because orthodoxy has been our prerogative for so long a time. The way things have shaped themselves among the Presbyterians reminds us that Liberalism is a hard foe to contend with and that inclusivism is certainly not the way to preserve the Christian faith for us and our children. J. T. M.

Luther a Precursor of Nazi Philosophy.—In *The Australasian Theological Review* (March 31, 1941) Prof. H. Hamann of our Adelaide Concordia reports a talk by Dr. K. Schechner, Ph.D., once of Vienna, now of Sydney University, who gave a series of lectures on "Nazi Philosophy and Christianity." The lectures were given wide publicity and one ("Precursors of Nazi Doctrine, from Luther to Bismarck") "profoundly impressed all students" who heard him "by his deep historical knowledge and ripe Christian faith," as the report states. Professor Hamann ventured the ordeal of listening to a man whose "accent and pronunciation were such that the listeners spent some minutes in making the mental adjustments necessary for complete understanding." However, what he said or at least implied was that Luther's ethics were vitiated or impaired by his teaching of salvation only through faith, without works, and through a faith that was altogether God-given; and "Luther was certainly represented as a precursor of totalitarianism because he, and still more the Lutheran theologians who followed him, taught that all government was by divine authority and was an instrument or agent of God." Professor Hamann writes: "Both these matters were challenged and corrected, during the discussion that followed the lecture, by men present in the audience; and the gentleman who occupied the chair drew attention to the fact that the note of authority in government had been struck long before Luther, by Him who asked: 'Whose is this image and superscription?' We must regretfully record the fact that we noticed nothing of 'ripe Christian faith.' There was one reference, evidently a negative one, to the 'theory of Christ's vicarious suffering and death.' We must learn the truth about Christianity and Christian ethics elsewhere. Historically, too, the lecture was far from satisfying. The development of thoughts and ideals that culminated in Nazi totalitarianism was traced from Luther to Bismarck via Rousseau, Kant, Fichte, Herder, Schlegel, Novalis, and romanticism generally, Hegel,

Schleiermacher, Moeser, List, Savigny, Ranke, Droysen, Sybel, Treitschke, Gneist — philosophers, men of letters, historians, jurists, economists, with one liberal theologian thrown into the bargain. Occasionally the lecturer referred to one or the other of these celebrities as Lutherans. When it was pointed out in the discussion that this was not borne out by the facts, he remarked: 'Perhaps we can compromise on the name Protestant.' But apart from this, the entire construction was highly artificial and therefore quite unconvincing. Frequently the points of contact and the similarities were names rather than realities. All this is not history but mythology, or, as one gentleman remarked to us when leaving the lecture hall, 'With such methods you can prove anything.'

For lack of space we could not quote the entire report of our esteemed colleague in Adelaide, but what has been cited is sufficient to show that supposedly scholarly men are still misrepresenting Luther as papistic writers have done now for more than four hundred years, and that the only way to smother such unhistorical abominations is to face those who perpetrate them. The ancient but pitifully lame excuse that "it won't do any good" is proved invalid not only by the Romanists themselves who, as is well known, quickly and slashingly reply to whatever they regard as false charges, but also by the very remonstrance reported by Professor Hamann. It is not difficult for any one to perceive how embarrassed Dr. Schechner must have felt after the friends of historical truth had called attention to his unhistorical approach.

J. T. M.

Quasi-Ecumenical Conference in Toronto. — For the sake of chronicling on the pages of the CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY all major religious and ecclesiastical happenings outside our own circles, we mention, although at a late date, the North American Ecumenical Conference held in Toronto, Canada, in June of this year. Not only the United States and Canada, but likewise Mexico, Central America, and several countries of South America were represented. The *Lutheran Companion* says the meeting "was attended by the most representative group of Protestant leaders that has ever come together on this side of the ocean to discuss problems of the Church." Of Lutheran bodies only the United Lutheran Church of America and the Augustana Synod participated. John R. Mott presided. Among the speakers Prof. Georgia Harkness advocated pacifism, while Prof. Reinhold Niebuhr manifested "flaming militancy," according to the *Lutheran Companion*. The editor of the *Lutheran Companion* (Augustana Synod), who was one of the delegates of his body, writes: "Theologically the Toronto conference was far beneath the high standards of the ecumenical meetings at Lausanne, Stockholm, Oxford, and Edinburgh. American Protestantism, as exemplified by its numerous Reformed divisions, found itself an impotent minority at those earlier European meetings. Moreover, it is no secret that it made the dismaying discovery, particularly at Edinburgh, that it was confessionally bankrupt. It had drifted so far from the main stream of Christian truth and thought that not even the Reformed Church of Europe could feel that it had much in common with its brethren from America. But the conservative leaven of the

European and Eastern Church was lacking at Toronto. American Protestantism was in the saddle. The few Lutherans who were there soon discovered that theology again was in disrepute. The means of grace were almost completely ignored. That the Holy Spirit uses the Word as a channel through which He transforms men's hearts seemingly was forgotten, except by Lutherans. The holy Sacraments were never mentioned. Instead of these divinely appointed instruments, which God has put into the hands of His Church to convict men of sin and to turn them to righteousness, American Protestantism apparently is trying to forge its own weapons. For the spiritual work of the Church it seems to have substituted a social program. Not to save men, but to reform society has become its objective."

After this indictment of American theological teaching, the editor of the *Lutheran Companion* asks the important question "Should Lutherans, then, remain aloof from the ecumenical movement? Should we say that we have nothing to gain from our fellowship with other Protestants?" His reply is: "By no means! Lutherans who were present at the European ecumenical meetings discovered that their contact with the various historic churches of Europe was quite stimulating. It would be sheer bigotry to take the position that we have nothing to learn from others. The truth of God is unchangeable, but there is such depth of divine wisdom that the mind of man can never exhaust its content, and we sometimes find in others certain shades of emphasis of which we ourselves previously had not been fully aware. However, we are persuaded that in America the Lutheran Church needs to maintain contact with the other Protestant communions for an altogether different reason. We have something to give which they sorely need. American Protestantism is in desperate straits. It is groping for light. It is floundering about, seeking for something solid for its feet to stand on. It is yielding to a sense of helplessness and futility. To a large extent it has forgotten the divine character of the Church, the divine character of the message God has given the Church, and the divine power which is working through the Church. Said a prominent Reformed churchman to the writer on the closing day of the Toronto conference: 'We need you Lutherans. You have stuck close to the old Gospel of personal redemption. We know that you, too, have a passion for social justice; but you have not paid the awful price that we have paid in pursuing that ideal.' And that is why the Lutheran Church must not divorce itself from the ecumenical movement. It is the greatest opportunity that will ever be given to us to bear witness to evangelical truth. If we possess the light, we should be filled with gratitude and not pride. And may God save us from hiding that light under a bushel!"

Thus far the *Lutheran Companion*. The argumentation employed by the writer, Dr. Ryden, would be correct if these conferences were held to achieve unity of doctrine. But since they ostensibly take doctrinal agreement for granted and merely wish to discuss the question, How may the Church become a force in the world? we feel that the Lutheran Church should remain aloof. Its staying away is a strong protest against the course which is based on the iniquitous slogan "We want deeds, not creeds."

A.

The Christian Laymen's Crusade.—The *Sunday-School Times* (July 27) tells very enthusiastically about the work of the Christian Laymen's Crusade, which has headquarters in Room 1111, 120 S. La Salle St., Chicago, Ill. This new laymen's venture grew out of the highly successful work of three definite groupings: the Gideons, whose specialty it is to place the Bible wherever travelers or others (its mission has been extended to supply public schools with Bibles) may read it; the Businessmen's Evangelistic Clubs; and the Christian Businessmen's Committees, "which do the speaking and preaching," as the *Times* reports. Of the Christian Laymen's Crusade, in particular, it says: "Our message is the old-fashioned one—rounded out, full-orbed, without hobby, a living Savior for a dying world! It will be proclaimed with new zest and from new quarters. Properly and prayerfully done, it will redound to the glory of God and to the Bible-believing, Gospel-preaching Church." Again: "Evangelism, soul-winning, is the happy portion of all redeemed men and women. The Almighty never intended that the load be carried by just a few. Now, we, as laymen, know that it is our business. Facing that sobering but thrilling thought, we resolve to carry on with the strength He provides."

Of course, we must understand the movement from the standpoint of the non-Lutheran (Reformed) churches in our country. In its peculiar form of proclaiming the Word it is possible there only. For example, the report says: "The Christian Laymen's Crusade seems likely to bring in a still greater day for the layman. It will uncover man-power not heretofore unearthed. Men will come and let their colors fly. Think of the effect of a week's campaign, well-planned and advertised, with a different professional or businessman in the pulpit every night, glorifying God with a living, burning passion to see dying men come to Christ, without regard to label or creed. That will be a new sight in our country. It will attract men not ordinarily found in God's house. The full-time ministry will have cause to thank God for their revived allies—men from stores, offices, and workshops, the doctor, lawyer, employer, and employee!" These men indeed do not wish to take the place of the regular ministers of the Word. The informing article explains: "A call solely from laymen to laymen! By the way, that is not a Scriptural term. We merely use it to differentiate between the man who gives full time to the Lord's work and the one who is on part time. We are so thrilled over His work that we oftentimes have difficulty in gearing down to the paltry things of time." If we take into consideration that some of these laymen are university professors, doctors, surgeons, merchants of prominence, attorneys, statesmen, and the like, and all of them are filled with a keen consciousness of the sweetness and truth of the Gospel of Christ, it is easy for us to visualize the importance of the "Crusade." Now, when many ministers have become Modernists, prominent laymen testify on behalf of Christ.

While touring through Indiana, we had occasion to listen to such a layman's witness. Our auto radio brought in very clearly the morning's report of the first session of the Winona Conference. The special feature of this convention was a testimony by a Christian layman, a certain Dr. Brown, "famous surgeon and physician from Vancouver, British

Columbia." He said some things to which we could not agree, as, for example, that the Old Testament prophets predicted the coming of the modern automobile, the modern airship, and the like. But what he said of verbal inspiration was truly Lutheran. He said (and we quote from memory): "I am one of the few that still believe in verbal inspiration. God did not give to the sacred writers merely the thoughts and then told them to look for words to express those thoughts. In that case I would not be sure if, after all, they found the right words to express the divine thoughts. In that case I could not say that the Bible is *God's Word*. But God, while giving the sacred writers the sacred thoughts, gave them also the sacred words, the words and thoughts going together, as the Bible teaches, so that the Bible from beginning to end is the Word of God in the fullest sense of the term. I believe the whole Bible is given by divine inspiration; I believe every word in the Bible is given by divine inspiration; and there is no one in the world who can show me that to believe this is unscientific." The address was so absorbing and vitalizing that long after we had wanted to stop for dinner we parked our car in the shade of a huge tree and listened with rapt attention till the speaker had finished his enthusiastic address. It is a remarkable thing that now, when sectarian ministers are failing to preach Christ, interested, believing laymen are taking their place to tell the world about "salvation through faith in Christ." J. T. M.

Prayer Is Power. — In the *Reader's Digest* (March, 1941) Dr. Alexis Carrel, brilliant biological research worker at the Rockefeller Institute, is quoted under this heading in an article, which greatly favors prayer for health and strength. In the excerpts there occur such expressions as these: "Prayer is not only worship; it is also an invisible emanation of man's worshiping spirit — the most powerful form of energy that one can generate. The influence of prayer on the human mind and body is as demonstrable as that of secreting glands. Its results can be measured in terms of increased physical buoyancy, greater intellectual vigor, moral stamina, and a deeper understanding of the realities underlying human relationships." "Prayer is a force as real as terrestrial gravity." "The triumphant hosannas of a great oratorio or the humble supplication of an Iroquois hunter begging for luck in the chase demonstrate the same truth: that human beings seek to augment their finite energy by addressing themselves to the infinite Source of all energy. When we pray, we link ourselves with the inexhaustible motive power that spins the universe. We ask that a part of this power be apportioned to our needs. Even in asking, our human deficiencies are filled, and we arise strengthened and repaired." "Properly understood, prayer is a mature activity indispensable to the fullest development of personality — the ultimate integration of man's highest faculties. Only in prayer do we achieve that complete and harmonious assembly of body, mind, and spirit which gives the frail human reed its unshakable strength."

We quote this mainly because the paragraphs, in general, seem to fit in so very well with the Christian minister's own program of prayer inculcation. If a brilliant student of biology thus speaks of prayer, there certainly must be a definite value in praying. Here, then, we have

a powerful appeal to reason. But Christians do not speak of prayer as does Dr. Carrel. To them prayer is not "the most powerful form of energy that one can generate." That is the modernistic view of prayer, not the Christian view. According to the Modernist prayer is essentially self-stimulation toward the performance of a difficult task, or a sort of autosuggestion by which one's powers are aroused to supreme action or the mind is calmed down to becoming resignation. There is, of course, a form of pseudoprayer which is both soporific and autohypnotic, somewhat similar to the war-dance which the Indian performs to receive courage to attack the enemy. But all this is not true prayer, not Christian prayer; and the difference between the two must be constantly pointed out to our hearers lest they mistake something for prayer which is not prayer. We need not describe here what Christian prayer is and how it should be wafted to God's throne of grace. But what seemed essential to us is that Dr. Carrel's article contains both truth and error and that our Christian people are not always able to distinguish between the two. Certainly, there is hardly a subject today which demands greater emphasis than that of Christian prayer. J. T. M.

On Theological Seminaries of the Northern Presbyterians.—An editorial in the *Presbyterian* gives the outsider an insight into the financial situation pertaining to the theological seminaries of its church-body.

"We have eleven theological seminaries under our Church. They are all now in need of strenuous financial support. A century ago the instruction of young men for the Christian ministry was a leading cause for the local interests of the various congregations. Then came a day when some very generous Presbyterians provided large sums as endowments and foundations, and the Church straightway forgot about the seminaries as objects of its benevolent support. Now those endowments are no longer capable of carrying the load of present-day needs. The Church once again must return to the cause. The seminaries, together, graduate about 200 men each year. Aid to students is furnished by the Board of Christian Education to the amount of \$28,000. The annual cost of educating the students is about \$800,000. Five eighths of this sum comes from endowments. Three eighths is required from gifts. The cause of our seminaries has been under consideration by the General Council for a year or more. Certain things need still to be done by certain seminaries as they set their fiscal houses in order before the Council will commend them to the Church as recipients of a part of the benevolent budget. When these steps have been completed this fall, it is expected that the Council will take steps to the end that in the budget plans of 1942-43 the theological seminaries will be found as regularly enrolled objectives." A.

Calvinism and Politics.—That Calvinism is not satisfied with merely preaching the doctrines and precepts of the Word of God but endeavors through its religious organizations to dictate the political course of events has often been pointed out. We call this one of the iniquitous features of the Calvinistic system. Calvinists, on the other hand, glory in this characteristic. It is very true that religion should profoundly influence

those who profess it in their political activities. But Lutherans holding to the principle that Church and State must be kept separate have always opposed the view that it is the Church's duty to chart a country's history. This may sufficiently introduce some remarks taken from an address of the famous Presbyterian minister Dr. Clarence Edward Macartney of Pittsburgh on the subject "Our Presbyterian Heritage." The address was published in the *Presbyterian* of May 22. —

Theoretically it might be thought that Calvinism with its doctrine of predestination would have had a restraining effect upon political revolt and would have influenced men to acquiesce in unjust government as their appointed lot. But practically, historically, it has had the very opposite effect. Wherever they have taken root, the principles of Calvinism and Presbyterianism have made men the relentless foes of ignorance, superstition, and despotism. In the words of James Anthony Froude: "It [Calvinism] has been able to inspire the bravest efforts ever made by man to break the yoke of unjust authority. When all else has failed, when patriotism has covered its face and human courage has broken down, when intellect has yielded with a smile or a sigh, when emotion and sentiment have become the handmaids of superstition and have dreamt themselves into forgetfulness that there was any difference between truth and lies, the slavish form of belief called Calvinism has borne an inflexible front to illusion and mendacity and has preferred rather to be ground to powder like flint than to bend before violence or melt under enervating temptation."

Of the truth stated by Froude, what a magnificent illustration and demonstration we have today in the sublime stand of the British people against the threat of tyranny and subjugation! The secret of that magnificent and heroic stand is undoubtedly religious faith.

The majority of the early settlers were Calvinists. It is estimated that two thirds of the three million inhabitants of the Colonies at the outbreak of the Revolution were Calvinists and nearly one third of Scotch or Scotch-Irish descent. Thus we understand what Ranke meant when he said that John Calvin was the virtual founder of America.

In the great crisis of the Colonial period, when the terrible news drifted back from the frontier of the disaster which had befallen Braddock's well-appointed army on the banks of the Monongahela in July, 1755, it was the voice of a Presbyterian minister in Virginia, Samuel Davies, afterwards president of Princeton, which more than any other stirred the Colonies to a victorious contention for the dominion of the American continent and its preservation for Anglo-Saxon and Protestant civilization. A.

Camps for Religious Objectors. — The National Service Board for Religious Objectors, in a bulletin released from Washington under date of July 7, states that there are nineteen civilian public service camps now in operation. "More than 1,200 conscientious objectors are now engaged in work of national importance under civilian direction" in the centers. The civilian direction is supplied by the American Friends Service Committee, the Brethren Service Committee, and the Mennonite Central Committee. There is also the camp, of which the name is the

Association of Catholic Conscientious Objectors. It is stated that "nearly a third of the total registrants certified by local boards as sincere conscientious objectors are Mennonites, with Brethren having the second-greatest number. Friends, Methodists, and Jehovah's Witnesses each have about the same number. Eighty-six different religious groups are represented among the 1,850 registrants now assigned or awaiting assignment to civilian public service camps.

"Two of the nineteen approved camps are working with the National Park Service; ten are operating in conjunction with the U.S. Forestry Service; and the remaining seven are working with the Soil Conservation Service."

The Lutheran

Predestination as Taught in the Protestant Episcopal Church.—In the Protestant Episcopal paper called *The Living Church* (Laymen's Magazine for August, 1941) Bishop Wilson answers a question pertaining to one of the Thirty-nine Articles, the confession of faith of the Protestant Episcopal Church, "Does Article 17, of Predestination and Election, mean that there are some who are in God's will determined by Him beforehand to be saved and others to be lost? Is this inside the area of our faith or outmoded?" We quote in full the answer of the Bishop: "This question might call for quite a dissertation. The article was drafted at the time the Church of England was confronted with the rigid doctrines of Calvinism. The Church declined to accept these doctrines, as the involved wording of the articles indicates. What it says is that the grace of God is given not because we deserve it but as a free gift. Nevertheless, it is necessary that we should cooperate in order to benefit thereby. Those who are called must, 'through grace, obey the calling'; 'they walk religiously in good works, and at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity.' The Church teaches the sovereignty of God and free will of man without attempting to reconcile the two. Calvinism, in search of a completely logical system, did attempt such a reconciliation—which resulted in the hard doctrine of foreordained election and damnation. The article expressly denies that God predestines any to destruction. It says that 'carnal persons' may be driven to desperation by the devil. The Church leaves it just where it is left in the Epistle to the Romans. The doctrine still holds good, though the cumbersome language of the Article is confusing and might be called outmoded."

The answer of the Bishop is not as clear as it should be. What he says about the necessity of cooperation might be regarded as a limitation of the grace of God, although his intention may be to point to the working together of the believer with the Holy Spirit after the new life has been engendered. In general it must be said that Article 17 of the Protestant Episcopal Church does not teach a double predestination, but merely a predestination to life, and in that respect represents the teaching of Luther and the other great Lutheran reformers.

A.

Godless Propaganda Strengthened During Past Year.—A strengthening of godless propaganda in Russia during the past year is reported by Comrade Yaroslavsky, leader of the League of Militant Godless, in a recent issue of the magazine *Antireligiosnik*.

Comrade Yaroslavsky stated that the total number of godless cells in the 62 subdivisions of the league on January 1, 1941, was 115,477, as against 95,159 during 1939. Enrolled members of the league were reported as 3,450,182, as against 2,292,036 in 1939.

He attributed the strengthening of godless propaganda during the year to the fact that the Communist Party not only seeks to promote the league in a general way, but also exercises a direct control over its work.

Pointing out that the influence of the Church has been weakened less than is often thought, the atheist leader declared this fact "calls for increased efforts by the Godless League." He also cited as a reason for increased activity the "future special tasks abroad, where, except in the United States, England, and Switzerland, all free-thinking associations have now been dissolved. . . ."—*Living Church*.

The Breakdown of Church Unity in France.—Ernest Gordon, in the *Sunday-School Times* (Aug. 24, 1941), reports under this heading the following: "M. Antomarchi says of the movement which united evangelicals and Unitarians in the French Reformed Church: 'The people were not instructed in the matter. They agreed to it without knowing or comprehending. At the consecration of the kings of France, when the moment came to put the crown on the royal forehead, a herald stepped to the door of the church and cried: Are the people satisfied with the king now given them? The crowd cried, Yes! The herald then reentered, saying that the people approved. Such was the process of church union in France. In *L'Esprit et la Vie* one discovers the consequences. Article 26 of the Discipline of the United Church says expressly that at the installation of pastors the Declaration of Faith must always be read. Now, at the recent installation of the new pastor in the Temple of Montpellier no reading of the Declaration of Faith took place. Why on so solemn an occasion did they omit it? Did they fear the impression it might make on certain liberals present? Did the venerable pastor, himself a conservative, not dare to impose this reading in spite of agreements? One fact is certain: in the installation of a pastor in one of our largest churches the Discipline was defied and the Declaration of Faith not read. It was ever so. The pledges of liberal theologians are as undependable as Hitlerian treaties. Dr. Karl Barth truly says: '*The only desirable church unity is that which is concerned with the content of the faith. The advantages of the modern idea of church unity are purely social and political. Their triumph is an indication of the spiritual decadence of the churches. A union which simply camouflages irreconcilable differences is far worse than a frank and loyal separateness.*'" The italics are our own and should bring into prominence sentiments for which our Church has always contended with great earnestness. The story is everywhere the same, whether in France, or England, or America: the pledges of liberal theologians are as valueless as promises of politicians. They are designed to draw confessing Christians into a union in which truly Christian confessions are not tolerated. We do not know from what source Mr. Gordon has taken the Barthian quotation; but truer and more timely words could not have been spoken than these.

J. T. M.

"The Dispensations."—In its issue of August 21 the *Presbyterian* brought an article by Hugh R. Munro, LL. D., having the above caption. The writer seeks to give his readers an idea of what is meant by "the dispensations" in modern Bible-study and endeavors to defend the Scripture interpretation represented by that term. He tells us that the respective scholars divide the history of the world into seven epochs, or dispensations. They are indicated by the terms: Innocence, Conscience, Government, Promise, Law, Grace, Kingdom. Every one will understand at once what these people mean when they speak of the age of Innocence, which ended when Adam and Eve were expelled from the Garden of Eden. The age in which Conscience "became the guiding principle" was ended when the Flood destroyed all human beings excepting Noah and his family. The era of Government, which then ensued, ended with the confusion of tongues with which God punished the proud, self-sufficient world. When God called Abraham, the era of Promise was inaugurated, also called that of the Covenant Promise. It likewise was concluded by a severe judgment, the bondage in Egypt. With the call of Moses began the epoch of the Law, which extended to the time when our Savior was born. It, too, was marked by a terrible judgment, that of the captivities of the ten tribes and of Judah and Benjamin. The era of Grace, in which we are living, will last till the voice of the archangel sounds (1 Thess. 4:13-18). The last dispensation, that of the Kingdom, is the age of the millennium. In it "the predicted Kingdom will find its full manifestation upon the earth, with Christ exalted to the seat of authority and power. In this coming era the dreams of prophets concerning a perfected human society will be realized, and the Covenant of Blessings through Abraham and David will reach fulfilment."

No unprejudiced person can read this article without noticing at once the arbitrary character of the division of time here presented. With the exercise of a little ingenuity a person might discover the dispensations to have been ten in number instead of seven. Again, the whole system with its premillennialism runs counter to the teaching of the plain passages of Scripture which tell us that the present era will be completed when the final Judgment will take place. In the clear utterances of the Scriptures there simply is no room for the millennial dreams submitted in the description of the so-called Seventh Dispensation. What fills one with sorrow is that this dispensationalism is championed by people who wish to cling to the full authority of the Scriptures and who accept the teaching of verbal inspiration. In their case it is the friends of the Scriptures who misunderstand them. One cannot close without voicing the prayer that many of those who are misguided by their fancies to accept millennial teachings may in spite of these vagaries fully accept Jesus as their only Savior and base their hope of everlasting happiness solely on God's love and Christ's atonement. A.

Japan. Nach der letzten Statistik gibt es in Japan 210,348 evangelische Christen mit 1,759 ordinierten japanischen Pastoren; dazu kommen weiter 168,477 evangelische Christen in Korea mit 1,050 ordinierten Pastoren, 14,859 evangelische Christen mit 12 ordinierten Pastoren auf Formosa und 49,164 evangelische Christen mit 61 Pastoren in Mandschukuo. Die

Zahl der Kinder, die evangelische Sonntagschulen besuchen, ist etwa noch einmal so groß, so daß sich rund eine halbe Million Erwachsener zur evangelischen Kirche bekennen und dazu gleichfalls eine halbe Million Kinder, die von den gottesdienstlichen Einrichtungen der Kirche erfasst werden. Bei dieser gegenüber der Gesamtbevölkerung kleinen Zahl ist es erstaunlich, daß anlässlich der Reichsgründungsfeier ein evangelischer Gottesdienst unter freiem Himmel in Tokio mit über 20,000 evangelischen Christen gefeiert werden konnte; ein Massenchor von über 500 jungen Sängern sang in japanischer Übersetzung „Wie schön leucht' uns der Morgenstern“ und „Ein' feste Burg ist unser Gott“. — Das japanische Innenministerium hat den Zusammenschluß der evangelischen Kirchen aller Schattierungen zu einer großen japanischen Kirche veranlaßt, deren Name auf alle Kirchen übertragen wird, auch wenn diese als Unterorganisationen weiterbestehen. Einmütig ist man der Meinung, von den Missionsgesellschaften keine Gelder mehr entgegenzunehmen, da dies des japanischen Volkes unwürdig sei. Einer der Pastoren wies auf der Jahresversammlung der Domei-Kirche, die der Liebenzeller Mission nahesteht, darauf hin, daß die Evangelisation eines Landes am besten durch Einheimische vollbracht werden kann. Er dankte den Missionaren aller Missionsgesellschaften für ihre bisherige Arbeit, meinte aber, daß das Christentum in Japan jetzt stark genug sei, sich selbst zu tragen und im eigenen Volke neue Kräfte zu gewinnen. Es würde auch den Japanern am besten gelingen, ihre Missionsarbeit der volksgebundenen Art anzupassen.

So berichtet die „Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung“. Mit Grauen denken wir an den Indifferentismus in Glaubenssachen, der durch solche Verhältnisse erzeugt und genährt wird.

Brief Items. — “At its annual meeting in February, 1941, the International Council of Religious Education reaffirmed its commitment to religious education on released time. Experience of more than a quarter of a century has brought to light the sources of weakness or failure of the plan. These are the wholesale introduction of a plan without sufficient preparation, inadequate training of teachers and supervisors, inadequate curricular materials, insufficient financial support, and the lack of complete understanding on the part of church and public school authorities.” — W. C. Bauer in *Christian Century* of August 6, 1941.

Bishop Manning of New York has been at the head of the New York Diocese of the Protestant Episcopal Church twenty years. Just to give our readers an idea of the extent of such a diocese, we submit the chief figures of his report for these two decades: 80,000 persons were confirmed, between 90,000 and 100,000 baptized, 142 candidates were ordained, 53 churches, chapels, and parish-houses were dedicated. The clergymen in the diocese number 421, the number of communicants, according to the last report, was 109,403. The contributions for all purposes amounted to about \$5,000,000 a year. The Cathedral of St. John the Divine belonging to this diocese is now about two-thirds built.

According to an exchange the United Presbyterian Board is launching a campaign to raise \$400,000 to complete its pension fund for ministers.

According to the church press five Protestant Episcopal bishops are in favor of our declaring war upon Germany at once: Bishops Hobson, Manning, White, Davis, and Budlong.

Myron C. Taylor, according to information submitted in the religious press, is still the representative of the President at the Vatican, although he now is in this country. His secretary, Harold Tittman, apparently still is in Rome.

A lamentable loss chargeable to the war is the death of Lord Josiah Stamp, a Christian economist of London, who with his wife was killed when on April 16 London was attacked in an air raid. His books on economics, written from the Christian point of view, have received wide recognition. Interesting is the notice that appeared in the *London Times* about him after his death: "Teetotaler, non-smoker, ethical teacher, he was a splendid example of British Puritanism at its best, and his modesty and keen sense of humor saved him from any touch of that unctuousness which sometimes spoils the effectiveness of a too earnest conscience." (Taken from *Christian Century*.)

The New Hampshire Supreme Court ruled in a sharply worded decision that school officials have no right to require salutes to the American flag by pupils. The decision reversed a verdict by the Nashua Municipal Court, which sent three children to the State industrial school for failure to salute the flag. Courts in other States have ruled differently, and the Supreme Court has refused to issue a Federal ruling.

Christian Century

The United Brethren Church voted unanimously in favor of union with the Evangelical Church (Albright Brethren). The plan will be submitted to both denominations. If it is approved by both, then the union will come about in 1947. The name chosen for the prospective merger is "Evangelical United Brethren." The United Brethren Church at present numbers somewhat more than 400,000 members. Its publishing house is located at Dayton, O.

Many years ago I wrote an article for a denominational paper concerning Diotrephes. The editor told me afterwards that twenty-five deacons had ordered the paper stopped as a protest against the personal attack in the paper. What I did in the article was to show that Diotrephes was a typical church "boss," who ruled the Church to suit his own whims. — Dr. A. T. Robertson, quoted in the *Watchman-Examiner*.

When Gov. Stassen of Minnesota (who belongs to the Baptist Church) proclaimed a State-wide holiday in honor of the Eucharistic Congress, meeting in St. Paul, he was criticized by the *Lutheran Companion* (Augustana Synod) for not observing the principle of separation of Church and State. One of its readers takes exception to the attitude of the *Lutheran Companion*. We hold that the criticism of the *Lutheran Companion* was justified. The governor of Minnesota had no right or authority to proclaim a holiday of this nature, thereby indirectly compelling all the citizens of the State to do homage to a particular Church, and, at that, a Church which has always fought the principle of religious freedom.

Free-will Baptists at their recent national convention decided to send five more missionaries to heathen countries. The workers are to go to India. Whether these people will be permitted to enter India is, of course, another question.

A.

Book Review — Literatur

All books reviewed in this periodical may be procured from or through Concordia Publishing House, 3538 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

This Is the Victory. By Leslie D. Weatherhead. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. Nashville, Tenn. 276 pages, 5½×8. Price, \$2.00.

A book written by so eminent a personage as Leslie W. Weatherhead, the well-known pastor of City Temple, London, will always be read with keen expectation, particularly if "written amid the crash of bombs," as the jacket states. One cannot read the book without being deeply moved by the conditions under which it was written and the harrowing experiences through which the author and his countrymen are now passing. These experiences have affected the author deeply. The first chapter, "Faith in Progress Shattered," is a frank and open confession on the part of a disillusioned man. "Our philosophy of life has broken down. We could not believe that in these 'progressive' days mankind would slip back to the bestial. Even Gibbon wrote: 'We cannot determine to what height the human species may aspire in their advances towards perfection; but it may safely be presumed that no people, unless the face of nature is changed, will relapse into their original barbarism.' So if faith is to be revived, faith in the victory of God, we need a new philosophy of life." (P. 41.) This philosophy is presented in some detail in the following chapters. We do not deny that this philosophy might produce an era of good feeling and make this world a better place to live in if universally adopted. A belief in God, the supreme Creator and Ruler of the universe, a belief which is not a mere assent but more than that, a firm conviction in the goodness of God and a confident trust in His guidance and leadership, overruling all evil for an ultimate good, such a faith would make for civic righteousness, for the shunning of wickedness, for a desire to live at peace and in harmony with one's fellow-men. But to call this philosophy a new philosophy of life is simply deceiving oneself. That is a philosophy as old as the hills and a philosophy that has time and again failed because it has resorted to wishful thinking rather than taken into consideration the hard facts actually confronting us. And these facts are sin and Satan. The latter is never mentioned in the book. And the author has an altogether faulty conception of sin. True, he writes: "The fact we forget, and which people hate hearing mentioned, is the fact of sin. Man is innately selfish. He is a glorious creature and can be made to behave like a son of God, but not by telling him he is an escalator called 'evolution,' not by changing his environment, giving him new programs or ideologies or isms, not by telling him he is getting better and better every day — not even by frightening him. No modernism, no culture, no act of Parliament, no education, no scientific discovery, no outward influence, will override the fact of original sin or blunt the fact of its pull." (Page 34.) He tells us: "We must settle down to the fact that unaided man is incapable of building a just world, let alone a perfect world. Even Mr. Joad in *Why War?* says: 'Evil will never be eradicated from human nature.' 'Never'

is a word which wise men never use! But it certainly is improbable that evil will be eradicated by culture and civilization and the things external to the spirit of man." (Page 35.) Yet he regards all the children of men as children of God, in all of whom God dwells as the loving Father, who suffers with His erring and suffering children. "But let us not forget our third truth, *that God is sensitive to all that wounds His world*. He is immanent in it, and wherever its harmony is broken, He Himself suffers from the disharmony. Never think of God as remote from human suffering, as a man who might sit on a wall and watch ants struggling in the dust below his feet. He is *in* it all, suffering, not physical agony, but a spiritual anguish far greater and too poignant for us to guess. . . . He is immanent and suffers more than we do, because His capacity for feeling is greater, His love deeper, His horror of sin more intense. God is the greatest casualty in this or any war; and while we are naturally concerned with our own troubles, He bears those of Finland and Poland and China and Spain and Abyssinia, Norway and Holland and Belgium and France and Greece, and has always carried the whole world's burdens. The problem is no different because it has been brought nearer to us. Do not, therefore, ask petulantly, 'Why does God let this happen?' Finish the question and say, 'Why does God let this happen to Himself?' (PP. 87-89.) And redemption? Here is the author's definition: "God is not remote and removed from our sorrow and pain. Because He is immanent in His world, and because infinite love means an infinite capacity for pain, He not only shares it but bears by far the greater portion Himself. Yet there is joy at the heart of the universe, for ultimately the price paid will not have been too great to buy the world that shall be. That is what redemption means." (P. 91.)

The author speaks of Jesus' resurrection, but, while speaking of it, gives up the Scriptural doctrine so clearly taught 1 Cor. 15 as the one and only basis of Christian faith. "His resurrection is equally unassailable, equally real. I am not now concerned with its manner or explanation. What happened to His body, to my mind, matters no more than what happened to His clothes. But certainly nothing less than the certainty that all that was essential in Jesus of Nazareth had survived death could have changed those timid men, hiding in fear of their lives, into bold missionaries who, within seven weeks of His crucifixion, *when any one could have produced contrary evidence if it were to be had*, were preaching His resurrection in the very city where He had been done to death—men who later died rather than deny that affirmation." (P. 211 f.) Such faith is not the victory, it is defeat, utter collapse, hopeless overthrow, 1 Cor. 15:17-19, even though the author closes the fifth chapter with the hope that, "please God, we shall emerge, nationally and individually, not embittered, vindictive, spiritually defeated, or blatantly, boastfully victorious, but cleansed, purified, redeemed, to find our goal in blessedness and all our dreams come true in Him who loved us and gave Himself for us that He might bring us *all* to God. This is the victory that overcometh, even our faith." (P. 107.)

TH. LAETSCH

The Bible and War. The Christian's Duty to His Country. By the Rev. Arthur F. Steinke, Pastor of Trinity Lutheran Church, Glen Cove, N. Y. The Studio Press, Brooklyn, N. Y. 47 pages, 5½×6. Paper binding. Price, 35 cts.

This well-written pamphlet takes issue with the pacifists. It inculcates the Biblical teaching that the Christian owes obedience to the government when it is compelled to wage a just war. It also inculcates true pacifism. Who would not want all wars to cease, seeing the great evils which result from any war? Wars will never cease in this sinful world, but what the Church can do in this matter is indicated in the statement: "To the extent that the Church carries out its mission and thus extends the spiritual kingdom of Jesus Christ, it helps to discourage and diminish warfare. Wars become less numerous and their horrors mitigated as the principles of Christianity pervade the world."—Valuable counsel is contained in the following: "The case is possible that the conscience of a Christian will not permit him to participate in a specific war because he is personally convinced that the war is an unrighteous one. In such a case he must voice his protest and refuse service even if it means ridicule, hatred, imprisonment, or even death. . . . If, however, because of the complexity of causes, the citizen is not able to determine for himself whether or not the war is just, he should obey the government, realizing that as a private citizen he may not be in possession of all the facts. It is Luther's advice (based on Rom. 13 and 1 Pet. 2:13) that even in case a Christian doubted the righteousness of his country's cause, he should give the government the benefit of the doubt."—We should like to pass on some of the *dicta memorabilia* with which the booklet abounds. General Lee: "I have fought against the people of the North because I believe they were trying to wrest from the South dearest rights. But I have never cherished vindictive feelings, and have never seen the day when I did not pray for them." The authors of a book published under the direction of Dr. William A. Brown write that they found "a distinctive attitude on the part of the Lutheran Church toward the State and toward political and social issues that set it apart from Roman Catholicism and from most of the other Protestant churches in this country." The historian Bancroft reminds us: "Luther alone has the glory of forbidding to fight for the Gospel with violence and death."

TH. ENGELDER

War in the Light of Prophecy. By Theodore Graebner. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 143 pages, 5×7½. Price, \$1.00.

This timely publication is "a new and revised edition of a treatise by the same author which appeared in 1918 under the title *Prophecy and the War*" (Introduction, p. III). The author's purpose is "to show that World War II as little as its predecessor of twenty-five years ago has any specific relation to the prophecies whose fulfillment is so confidently asserted by most Fundamentalists of today" (p. V). At the same time it is "a plea for a sane and thoroughly Scriptural outlook upon the affairs of the Church and world in these Latter Days" (p. V). The book has grown from 112 to 143 pages, much of the material contained in the first edition having been condensed or omitted and a mass of new

information having been added. It is really a new and thoroughly up-to-date book, not merely a revised edition. The author takes up one by one the absurd claims that various adherents of millennialism, such as Russelites, Dispensationalists, and others, advance with a brazen cocksureness that defies history, logic, above all the clear Word of God, and shows convincingly that these claims are unscriptural and anti-Biblical and that the "predictions" of millennialists have invariably and ignominiously failed. Special chapters are devoted to the Return of Israel, the Antichrist, the Millennium, and Kingdoms and Wars of the Latter Days. Chapter IX exposes the fallacies of the date-setting interpreters. The closing chapter offers a few pertinent rules on "How to Read Prophecy."

While one may differ from the author in some of the views expressed, e.g., in his grouping together of Stalinism, Fascism, and Nazism on p. 140, we are convinced that a study of this treatise will help to safeguard our Christians against the dangerous poison of millennialism as disseminated by most Fundamentalists of our day and by the notorious Jehovah's Witnesses, who are making every effort to seduce our members also. We urge all pastors to call the attention of their parishioners to this timely publication.

THEO. LAETSCH

The Building of a Great Church. A Brief History of the Lutheran Church in America with Special Reference to the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States. By W.G. Polack, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo. Second edition, revised and enlarged. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 235 pages. Price, \$1.25.

This book had its origin in articles written for the *Young Lutherans' Magazine*. These were published in book form in 1926 for use in school and Sunday-school. That should be the prime purpose of this edition, too, to give our children a knowledge of the beginnings of our Church in this country—though adults whose education in this respect has been neglected in their youth will here find useful information, too. The author has revised the material and brought it up to date, including the convention of 1938. So this edition is almost double the size of the former; yet it only whets the appetite of the reader for a larger, more comprehensive history of our American Lutheran Church. We hope that a wide use of the book will not only serve the purpose of acquainting our youth with our foundation story and particularly with the men to whom, under God, we owe the existence of our Church, but that it will also stimulate the demand for more, for a complete modern history of Lutheranism in America.—Statistician S. Michael has provided this edition with a serviceable index of 13 pages.

THEO. HOYER

Social Wellsprings. Fourteen Epochal Documents by Pope Leo XIII. Selected, arranged, and annotated by Joseph Husslein, S. J., Ph. D., St. Louis University. The Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, Wis. 284 pages, 6¼×9¼. Price, \$2.50.

We are sure that Protestant scholars interested in the vital social subjects which these encyclicals treat will be grateful to Dr. Husslein

for publishing in so handy and practical an edition fourteen outstanding encyclicals by Pope Leo XIII, easily the most forceful and expressive of modern Popes. Encyclicals, in their official form, do not make easy reading; nor are they intended for popular study. But Father Husslein has edited those collected in this book so well that any reader of average intelligence and education can study them with profit. Each encyclical has been given its own special preface, intended to serve as a brief orientation, to stimulate interest, and to lend additional zest to the reading of the accompanying document. Some of the editor's finest work has gone into the elaboration and disposition of these helpful analyses. New paragraphs, in agreement with modern usage, have been put in place of the paragraphing of the originals, making the text far more intelligible, while marginal titles have been supplied to simplify the study of the pronouncements, and italics, sparingly but intelligently employed, emphasize cardinal points. Explanatory notes elucidate or interpret the text, where this is necessary. The formal headings and ceremonious conclusions of the originals have been eliminated, and bibliographical references have been appended at the end of the editorial prefaces to the respective encyclicals. To the twelve social encyclicals have been added, by way of appendices, Leo's educational encyclical on Christian Philosophy (1879), in which he encourages renewed study of Thomas Aquinas, and an extensive extract from his apostolic letter written in the year of his death (1902) and picturing the condition of the world and the struggle of the Church at that time. A double index (a general index and an index to *Rerum Novarum*) greatly helps the student to find topics of special interest. In their new form the titles of the encyclicals read: "Evils of Society"; "The Socialists"; "Christian Marriage"; "Civil Government"; "Christian Constitution of States"; "Abolition of African Slavery"; "Human Liberty"; "Chief Duties of Christian Citizens"; "The Condition of the Working-men"; "Rosary and Social Question"; "Consecration of Mankind to the Sacred Heart"; "Christian Popular Action," and those of the appendices: "Our Social Foundation" and "The Grand Review." In a book review, which by its very nature is limited to essentials, it is, of course, impossible to enter upon the doctrines and theology of these papal pronouncements. This might be done later in a special article, for these social encyclicals represent the attitude of the Catholic Church toward practically all modern social phenomena and problems. There is an immense amount of information contained in these encyclicals and Husslein's *Social Wellsprings* belongs into the libraries of theological schools.

J. THEODORE MUELLER

Occasional Addresses. By F. J. Lankenau, D.D. Concordia Publishing House. 108 pages, 5×7½. Price, \$1.00.

This volume presents twelve addresses, selected and edited by Prof. F. Lankenau of St. John's College, Winfield, Kansas, delivered at various occasions by Dr. F. J. Lankenau, who died in July, 1940, after a rich career in the parish ministry amplified by a multitude of speaking and preaching engagements and by service to the Church at large, culminating in the office of Vice-President of the Missouri Synod. The

volume is, in a sense, therefore a memorial of love and will be welcomed by many who were stirred by the mellow but powerful personality of the sainted Dr. Lankenau.

The volume is to be commended, however, as a direct contribution to the art of sacred rhetoric. Stylistically, Dr. Lankenau stood between two epochs. In a slight formality of utterance, abundance of adjectives, sonorousness of cadence, his lines look to the past. But in a pungency and even homeliness of practical thought, a reverting to the Anglo-Saxon phrase, and a concreteness of imagery, they are very much of the present. Above all, these addresses offer a splendid illustration of a great pastor at work applying to *all* problems of life, including those of citizenship and vocation, the guidance and the stimulus of God's Word. For that duty every pastor may find these addresses an inspiration in form and method.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

How Shall I Say It? By Ross H. Stover, S. T. D., D. D., LL. D. Muhlenberg Press, Philadelphia. 175 pages, 5½×9. Price, \$1.00.

Public Speaking for College Students. By Lionel Crocker, Ph. D. American Book Company. 480 pages, 5½×8½.

Ross Harrison Stover is pastor of Messiah Lutheran Church at Philadelphia and professor of Public Speaking in Temple University School of Theology. He is very successful as a pulpit and platform speaker. He calls his book "The Art of Public Speaking." The brief, at times sketchy, notations, the illustrations, and the introductions by friends of the author to the various parts of the book give a glimpse of the vigorous personality and practical outlook of the author. Some sections of the book reveal the older approach to platform speech; we note the interest in the *vibrato* tone and the somewhat formalized concept of gesture. Others are the result of close study and observation as well as practical method; here we note the chapters on breathing and the voice. The material on inflection is limited, even for the scope of this book, and the sentences on the question misleading. Much of the material on content and personality is inspirational; it is through the writer's own use and presence that the book doubtless comes into its own. All pastors, however, will enjoy this vigorous and brief summary of speaking experience.

D. Crocker is professor of Speech at Denison University. His book is a most interesting blend of the Aristotelian concepts of persuasion and the current functional approach to speech. The book presents sections on The Speaker, The Speech, The Audience, and The Occasion. From the opening pages with their suggestions for directness, through the remarks on ways of delivering the speech, hints on diction, compact but complete materials on phonation and articulation; discussions of the speech itself with varieties of proof, of interest with a fine chapter on Illustrations, of structure and outlining; aims of speech with ample study of language to achieve certain results; analysis of the audience and the study of persuasion; concluding with a survey of speech situations and a useful chapter of radio speech—all in all, we have here an almost encyclopedic review of speech, but always fresh, homely, and compact.

A useful collection of exercises and materials, with much emphasis on current literature, is appended. This book, despite its text-book title, is of use to every speaker, present or prospective, who needs to learn and keep in mind the purpose of his speaking, namely, to change people's minds. Possibly the analysis in some instances is broken down too far, especially by means of classification brought in from other authors; but we should probably not find fault with the individual elements of the structure if the whole is so usable. Despite the compression of the material the author achieves a direct and unhurried style. This is facilitated by a diligent use of illustrative excerpts, much of it right from the current-speech scene. Our college instructors as well as our pastors should work with this book.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

Statistical Year-Book of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States for the Year 1940. Compiled by Rev. Samuel Michael, Statistician of Synod. Concordia Publishing House. 250 pages, 6×9. Price, \$1.00.

Here in tables, graphs, lists, and terse sentences is the distillate of a year of the lives and labors of 5,797 professional workers and of over 1,400,000 baptized people on five continents in the vocation as Christians. Within the cramped limitations imposed by the ability of human mind and sense to report and tabulate, and of fact and figure adequately to reflect, it is a summary of what God hath wrought through (and perhaps sometimes despite) us. In so far as the life and activity of a spiritual entity (such as our Synod) can be portrayed statistically, it represents the state of our sector of the visible Church as the eye of man discerns it.

One can — and should — spend hours assimilating, interpreting, and reflecting upon, its contents.

R. A. JESSE

BOOKS RECEIVED

From Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, London:

The Gospel of Salvation. By Hyman Appelman. 154 pages, 5¼×7¾. Price, \$1.00.

Consider Him. By Vance Havner. 100 pages, 5¼×7¾. Price, \$1.00.

